DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 535 JC 740 085

AUTHOR Kintzer, Frederick C., Ed.
TITLE Summer Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and Wives.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Graduate School of Education
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 85p.; Workshop conducted at UCLA, July 8-13, 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Board Administrator Relationship; *College Administration; *Community Colleges; Conference Reports; Educational Administration; Personnel Management; *Presidents; Student Personnel Services; Teacher Evaluation; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

The report on the 1973 Summer Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and Wives contains the presentations, or summaries of them, made by members of the workshop staff and summaries of the major discussions. These papers and discussions are: (1) Community College Administration: Part I, Great Challenges Ahead, and Part II, Design and Implementation of a New Philosophy of Community College Education; (2) President-Board Relationships: Building a Bridge of Communication; (3) The Human Side of Management: Applications to Community College Administration; (4) State, Regional, and National Systems of Education: Coordination or Control?; (5) Panel Discussion on Instruction: Why Be Concerned?; (6) Human Development: Self-Actualization by Group Process; (7) Student Personnel Services; (8) Evaluation of Professional Performance; (9) Recommended Evaluation Procedures for MCCCD; (10) Office of Affirmative Action at Grossmont College; (11) Organization and Administration of Community Services Programs; and (12) New Community Programs: A Symposium. Sessions for presidents' wives dealt with the topics of their role, human potential, achieving goals, flower arranging, and entertaining. (KM)

ED 088535

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Summer Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and Wives

Frederick C. Kintzer
Editor

JC 740 085

Graduate School of Education
University of California, Los Angeles

July 8—13, 1973

CONTENTS

Page

Preface ii

Participants 1

Sessions for Presidents' Wives 3

PAPERS PRESENTED

Community College Administration:

Part I: Great Challenges Ahead 5

Part II: Design and Implementation of a New Philosophy of Community College Education 11

President-Board Relationships: Building a Bridge of Communication . . 15

The Human Side of Management: Applications to Community College Administration 21

State, Regional, and National Systems of Education: Coordination or Control? 31

Panel Discussion on Instruction: Why Be Concerned? 35

Human Development: Self-Actualization by Group Process 41

Student Personnel Services 45

Evaluation of Professional Performance 51

Recommended Evaluation Procedures for MCCCD 57

Office of Affirmative Action at Grossmont College 65

Organization and Administration of Community Services Programs 71

New Community Programs: A Symposium 81

PREFACE

The 1973 Summer Workshop for New Community Junior College Presidents and Wives, an annual event sponsored by the Community College Leadership Program of the UCLA Graduate School of Education, was held at Hedrick Hall, July 8-13 on the university campus. Participants in the week-long workshop represented community and junior colleges in nine states.

This publication contains the presentations (or summaries of presentations) made by members of the workshop staff. Summaries of the major discussions are also included. Special recognition is due the workshop staff for their substantive contributions and for helping to plan and conduct sessions. A total of 36 individuals, including community college administrators and teachers, university professors, and other professionals from all parts of the country and from Canada, gave generously of their time and energies. Many attended sessions of their own to participate in discussions and to work individually with the administrators.

While this report is prepared primarily for participants and staff, copies are available from the Office of the UCLA Community College Leadership Program, Moore Hall, Los Angeles, California 90024, to anyone else who is interested.

Co-directors were Frederick C. Kintzer and Ruth Kintzer. Dennis R.W. Wing and Marjorie Wing served as Assistant Directors.

PARTICIPANTS
SUMMER WORKSHOP
FOR
COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND WIVES
JULY 8-13, 1973
UCLA

President Thomas E. Atcitty (Vicki)
Navajo Community College
Many Farms, Arizona

President Nolen M. Ellison (Carole)
Seattle Central Community College
Seattle, Washington

President Richard J. Ernst
(Elizabeth)
Northern Virginia Community College
Annandale, Virginia

Executive Dean James L. Evanko
(Bernice)
Community College of Allegheny County
Allegheny Campus
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

President James S. Fitzgerald (Marion)
Foothill College
Los Altos Hills, California

President Tom E. Gary (Christie)
Martin College
Pulaski, Tennessee

President H. Deon Holt (Diane)
Richland College
Dallas, Texas

President Dean M. McDonald (Alene)
College of Eastern Utah
Price, Utah

Executive Dean Richard W. McDowell
(Ann)
Community College of Allegheny County
Boyce Campus
Monroeville, Pennsylvania

President Henry M. Milander (Joan)
Olympic College
Bremerton, Washington

President Raymond J. Needham (Kaye)
Linn-Benton Community College
Albany, Oregon

President Mary M. Norman
Community College of Allegheny County
South Campus
West Mifflin, Pennsylvania

President Henry O. Pete (Jane)
Rogue Community College
Grants Pass, Oregon

President Eugene A. Pimental (Marge)
Los Angeles Harbor College
Wilmington, California

President Irwin L. Spector (Edna)
Pima College
Tucson, Arizona

SESSIONS FOR PRESIDENTS' WIVES

Gordon Campbell (Associate Professor of Education, University of Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada) was assigned the topic "The Role of the President's Wife." He chose to emphasize the wives' need to know each other as participants. An immediate bond of friendship within the group was established by having participants interview and introduce each other. Numerous techniques were used to help individuals listen and remember more effectively during introductions, resulting in a deeper awareness of others. Pinpointing the broad problems of each individual revealed much similarity within the group. A basis was thus established for sharing during the workshop sessions that followed.

Under the leadership of Joan Lasko (Lecturer, Graduate School of Management, UCLA), a full day was devoted to "Human Potential," mainly to the "process of choice"--the unique way each individual deals with the expectations of others. Awareness of one's own needs, abilities, and strengths is crucial if this process is to be fulfilling. Through exercises and discussions, participants achieved a clearer knowledge of their own style and preferences. The diversity of thought expressed by others helped to reinforce the value of each individual's responses. At the same time, the discussions broadened the perspective on alternatives that might be tried.

Diane Holt, a participating president's wife, led a follow-up session on human potential with the discussion of the principles of the movement and how presidents' wives could put them to use in their public and private lives. Several concerns centering on family life were explored: the amount of time and companionship presidents are able to give to wives and children; child-rearing practices, especially discipline; and role conflicts of women both as individuals and as presidents' wives.

Television Commentator Mary Dorr presided at the discussion on "Achieving Goals." She challenged presidents' wives to master the art of communication, which is basic to success in any field. Looking beyond the confines of immediate experiences can provide the impetus for achieving broader goals. The morning discussion was brought to a stirring climax by Mrs. Dorr's dramatization of true stories of people who, through unusual circumstances, found new meaning in their lives, thereby becoming capable of greater service to others.

Harold Vander Sluis (floral expert) and his assistant, John Anderson, conducted a demonstration on "Floral Arranging" in the home economics room at Santa Monica College where a large overhead mirror enabled viewers to watch procedures from numerous angles. Materials and methods were described as many arrangements were created that could be duplicated at home.

A panel on "Entertaining" featured three hostesses who approach their role as wives of community college administrators with enthusiasm. Norma Jo Harlacher outlined in detail the planning and preparation for a dinner party for 35. Having two such events back-to-back enables her to make most of the advance work serve for the consecutive functions. Helen Casey described large faculty receptions, which bring her pleasure. Guests from the community and other nearby institutions, along with informal programs, add new interest to events of this

kind. Kathy Koltai, as wife of a chancellor in a multi-college district, stressed the importance of observing protocol in entertaining. Great care must be taken to avoid favoritism in entertaining administrators and faculty from the various campuses. Not to be overlooked are board members who serve the several colleges in the district. She enjoys having each event in her own home and doing most of the cooking herself. The three participants made practical suggestions on how to capitalize on things a hostess enjoys or does best.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

PART I: GREAT CHALLENGES AHEAD

Joseph W. Fordyce

Many things make this a wonderful experience for us. One delightful thing about being hosted at UCLA is that so many of our colleagues come with us. We especially like being here with the B. Lamar Johnsons, who have meant so much to us over the years, and with all the rest of you who have contributed so much to the development of junior colleges. I restrict my remarks tonight because tomorrow brings an experience I have looked forward to for a long time. East Coast radio announcers say, "And now we will have a repeat performance for the people on the West Coast." Tomorrow, I get to do a repeat performance, and shall be interested to hear in the morning what I said tonight!

We are particularly pleased of course with anything new and if you have to pick anything, a president is as good a thing as is likely to come along. I have been engaged in contemplating the kinds of new presidents there are, and have tried to corroborate them from the present list and from visiting with old friends and acquaintances here. My early training was in Latin and, after having discovered that all of Gaul was divided into three parts, I continue to divide everything else into three parts. I came up with three categories that I am sure have already occurred to you: (1) new presidents of new institutions, (2) new presidents of old institutions, and (3) old presidents in new positions. I am sure each of you recognizes where he fits in that particular paradigm. I also suspect that each of you, during the course of the week, will have to translate for himself and determine just exactly how his newness pertains to it. In most things that we do, I am increasingly impressed with the fact that innovation becomes a kind of distillation of the wisdom of the past. Obviously, as the future always becomes yesterday (and I suppose that yesterday becomes tomorrow), we see a beautifully circular situation. As you look to the decade of the '70s, therefore, however you fit into this paradigm of newness, you will find new challenges, new hopes, new inspirations, new plans, and new kinds of situations to which you will need to react.

This evening I shall ask several questions; tomorrow may or may not supply the answers. I am particularly pleased that the challenges and issues that lie ahead for community college administrators have coincided in an almost marvelous way with the issues scheduled for discussion here this week. This means that I can pose the questions tonight and have an excellent backup team for the rest of the week to examine with you, and you with them, the important issues.

First, there is presently great uncertainty and doubt about the basic question of the aim of higher education. What is higher education all about, for whom is it intended, what is the public understanding of it, will the people support what they think of when they talk about higher education? The public may be thinking of something quite different from any of us when we talk about public higher education or higher education generally. Whatever the public has in mind about public higher education, it is not particularly the darling it was in the '50s and the '60s. This issue overrides all others and, unless we make up our own minds on the aim of higher education and communicate

it to the public, we are indeed in trouble, in a perilous position. Certainly such a question as whether there is too much higher education is often on the public mind. Is the fact that some people with the doctorate cannot find employment specifically related to that doctorate the great tragedy that the people in the streets and some of our colleagues in higher education seem to think it is? If so, then certainly the whole question of reshaping our value systems is very much with us.

The time-honored controversy of general vs. special education has a special significance as we try to determine for ourselves, so that we can transmit to others, the aim of higher education. Among students, the greater mobility, the greater attempt at academic shopping, and the turning-off to the necessity or the desirability of higher education are challenges that transcend all the rest. Indeed only as we can relate the other questions we pose today can their potential answers make any sense in a meaningful context.

The second question is one of financing. How much are the people willing to pay for what? The relative roles of the federal government, of the state governments, of the various regional organizations, and particularly of local governmental units (and all of these in turn as they relate to the extent of the burden we place on the individual), how much the student himself or his family will be expected to pay in relationship to government and nongovernmental sources of funding are among the great issues facing us over the next several years. The issues that have been raised in reference to the support of the public schools will pertain equally to higher education as the years go by.

Will the public support other than what it deems to be economically rewarding either to the individual himself or to the society at large? Once again this question certainly is a spin-off of the question of what higher education is all about, because whatever its aim, it is going to amount to relatively little until the public at large is willing to accept that function as important, and is willing to provide the financial support.

Closely related to the matter of financing, our third question is the whole matter of governance. Each of you, if you have been in office a month or more, is painfully aware of the questions relating to governance in this day and age. There is governance from the outside. What are the relative roles of those external forces? The role of the federal government? The role of the state government? The role of the local constituencies as represented for most of us in the community colleges by a board of trustees? Internally, the growth of administration has been one of the dramatic phenomena of the last 20 years or so in higher education. Any of you who have had any experience in this whatsoever know that, every time you pass a simple rule or regulation in whatever kind of governance structure you have internally, the enforcement of that rule and regulation means additional administrative personnel and administrative commitment of your resources. How can you have the opportunity to continue the kind of administration that seems necessary and proper in relationship to the other forces, governmental and otherwise, that will undoubtedly impinge on you to a marked degree over the years to come?

On Tuesday afternoon our old friend and colleague, James L. Wattenbarger, and our distinguished friend from southern California, Edward Simonsen, will

speak on the various relationships between governmental structures and the governance of institutions. They will also speak of the tremendously yeasty concerns of the internal forces of governance, the general mode of governance within the institution, those parts of governance for which the institution itself has the responsibility and authority to make decisions. How can the various forces best be managed? Who should participate, how, and in what phase? In administrative principles, in total development of curriculum, in student personnel policies and procedures, and in what other areas should all of the people within an educational community participate?

For most, there are the peculiar governance problems of the multi-campus district. Before the week is over, you will hear from Chancellor Koltai on this particular question. Tomorrow afternoon, you and he will be talking about board relationships and how they relate to the special problems of the multi-college or multi-campus district. You will also hear from James H. Nelson on a certain aspect of governance as he talks about the human side of management, so essential whatever the governance pattern.

The fourth question is whom to serve. The whole question of open admissions, which we have taken for granted in the community college, is up for debate and reassessment. There are new students just as there are new presidents. How can we legitimately relate to a policy of open admission and pay no attention to the new crop of new kinds of individuals? Human beings are human beings first of all; there is more sameness about us than there are differences. We make a terrible mistake when we do not recognize that fact, but it still remains that there are great differences. If we are indeed committed to a concept of open admissions, of everyone being eligible for postsecondary education, we must accept the corollary concept that everybody is capable of meaningful patterns of postsecondary education. Providing such patterns is one of the greatest challenges lying before us and one that only your ingenuity can resolve. We shall hear the discussion with Ervin Harlacher on this and related subjects. Jerome Karabough has a great article in the Educational Record, Winter 1972, to which we shall refer again tomorrow. He quotes from Thomas Carlyle: "That there should be one man die ignorant who has the capacity to learn, this I call a tragedy." This indeed is the essence of open admission.

Question five is how we shall serve. What form will the curriculum take? Is it possible to break from the terrible dilemma in which we find ourselves: that between vocational, special education on one hand and general, liberal education on the other? For many individuals, at a particular time, the most liberalizing education they could possibly have is how to manipulate a left-handed Phillips screwdriver. How do you propose to bridge this tragic gap? How will you put all aspects of education into meaningful perspective for the new crop of students?

What do you do about student services? I note that Jane Matson, who has thought about this more than anyone else, will talk about student services and counseling. What kind of new meaning can this part of the educational program have in the decade ahead if we are to meet the challenge? In my judgment, it must be more than the counselor who approaches his job primarily from a clinical point of view, on a one-to-one basis, when there are a thousand other students or potential students who cannot possibly meet that kind of scheduling

and that kind of expense. It takes a new approach if the curriculum and the student services, the two devices through which we provide direct service to students, are to meet the challenges of the future.

A sixth concern is where we shall serve. Can we really be community-based in a new and meaningful way? We have gone through our period of developing monuments to architects, and I have great admiration for many of the physical plants that have been developed. It seems that the developers have made magnificent contributions to the community college movement over the last 15 years. On the other hand, some institutions, frequently with a great deal of regret, almost an embarrassment, have explored the possibilities of a "storefront" education, using the old public school building, the old hotel, the forsaken office building. What have these cycles produced? What have we learned? This is going to remain a challenge to all of us, new and old alike, over the next ten years. What kind of facilities will best serve the growing needs of the community college?

Number seven is who shall educate. Who is the "we" we have been talking about? I am pleased that James Fitzgerald and his colleagues will be talking about instruction and the role of the instructor. No doubt he will include the counselor, for the counselor-teacher is the essential educative team, the direct service team. What kind of person should be selected for this? If we cannot select the right people, what can we do about those we do get to help them become the appropriate people to carry on this function? What are the rights and responsibilities that fall on these teacher-counselors? How can effective teaching-counseling be appropriately rewarded? How can good teacher-counselors be rewarded so that they can be the honorable people, the members of the greatest profession, the kind of people most of them want to be, namely, those who really facilitate the learning process? Our task is critical. How can we, in turn, facilitate that kind of teacher-counselor-learner relationship? This is the job of the administrator, and he has no greater challenge.

Number eight concerns the whole question of the educational environment, a challenge that will be continuously with us. We work in an environment, a milieu, not in isolation. All aspects of society impinge on us. Often we do not look at, we do not listen to, we do not feel all these other forces that should become part of us much more definitely and much more surely than we are inclined to permit.

One such force is our relationship with other educational institutions. We have been much concerned over articulation with other institutions of higher education, with the question of transfer of students, and with the exchange of credits at the forefront. The question of who determines the curriculum and how it can be appropriately related to the curricula of other institutions has been a continuing concern for us for many years.

We have been inclined to take too much for granted in our relationships with the institutions from which our students come—the secondary schools of the nation. No longer may they be considered only as training units for colleges. All of us in higher education must learn to recognize that they have their own identity and integrity.

Beyond this is the whole social context. We live in a world of technology, a push-button world. One of the frustrations of educational administrators is that they are looking for those buttons to push in educational administration and find them strangely elusive. In all of today's social change, educational administration has become a new art and a new science. Can education help to build a new social order? It is only one aspect of a magnificent question.

Number nine is the final question. What is our ideational environment? What do we believe about what goes on in people's minds? More specifically, what do we believe about human beings? This comes back to our first concern, the aims of higher education, although it is more than that and, in a sense, subsumes all the rest. What do we believe about people? This is the greatest issue facing the educational administrator today. It must be in beliefs, in judgment, in values, no matter whether implicit or explicit, that we make every decision. What we believe about human beings is essential, for we are in the business of human beings.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

PART II: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

Joseph W. Fordyce

In Part I, we listed a number of challenges facing community colleges in the next decade. Now we examine how some resolution of them may be sought. A whole new educational philosophy is required. As we attempt to look at a new philosophy of community colleges, we become increasingly aware of the difficulty of being really new. One immense frustration is to dream up a great idea, one that glows brightly, only to find that X college inaugurated it 15 years ago. But we can put aside our frustrations on that point, because uniqueness is not really necessary. What is necessary is the process--the process of attempting to think through to what is meaningful and relevant (in the best sense of the word) to the needs of the people we attempt to serve. In that process, even if we never have a completely new idea, the very process itself is a form of rejuvenation, of revitalization, of thinking through again the basic process of living, the basic processes of human life, and how education as a great institution can contribute to them. As our takeoff point, because we believe the process is so complex, so demanding, so challenging, we should join in a great revolution, a declaration, not of interdependence, but of independence. This is not meant in any negative or defensive way; it is just that we have so much to do that we can do no less than declare our independence in the sense that it will facilitate our moving ahead, to face squarely and openly the issues and challenges listed in Part I of this paper. It is an independence freed from traditional thought that is urged upon you. There is nothing necessarily wrong with tradition (as a matter of fact, in the haste to find something new, we may find something wrong), but, in the process of discovering that we are wrong, we will have been right in the much better sense of the word. It is that kind of independence that will free us from some of the nomenclature, from some of the petty regulations and rules, from some of the out-moded practices that make administration so much more difficult than it needs to be. (I once inherited a catalog that contained a beauty of a regulation. It simply said, "There will be no absences." I began thinking about how I could administer that regulation, for I realized that I would need seventeen truant officers, six physicians, seventeen nurses aides, and one psychiatrist--the latter, of course, for the administrators.)

We are in the community junior college. In this role we have a uniqueness, a sense of mission about our aims that frees us from concern with binding tradition. I suggest that the independence we are advocating will free us of our hangups, will get rid of our endless squabbling and controversy among ourselves and among our colleagues, and will permit us to know ourselves and to know the institutions we are and the institutions we have the potential to become. It will free us to know our community and become part of that community, will establish its goals, its role, and its scope in a way that no longer depends on any other kind of institution in the whole of our great society. An independent person is not an arrogant person; he is not one who sulks in his corner and

contemplates the world from a great distance. An independent person (and an independent institution) is one who, knowing his own goals and his own strengths, can mix and be part of the world around him in a meaningful way, making his contribution in his unique direction and form.

This Part II will examine some of the "spin-offs" of this independence, of being part of a new kind of educational establishment that by and large our nation has never seen before.

Point number one is a new curriculum that will enable us to throw such words as vocational education, career education, occupational education, general education, liberal education all into the ashcan. What indeed is education? Its goal is not to produce educated people, not to produce trained people, but to produce educative people who love education, who love learning, and for whom that learning becomes a lifelong process as necessary and meaningful as the fresh air they breathe and the food they eat. We do not decry or denigrate in any sense the major, basic aims and purposes of education, one of which is certainly appropriate orientation and preparation for entry into the world of work. Education must provide the opportunity for complete and adequate preparation for occupational careers, for careers in the world of work, but much more importantly, for careers in the world of living itself. This is the new kind of curriculum we urge, and it must have a centrality, a unity to it. To characterize the curricular offerings of a community college, it seems that the words "coordinative" and "integrative" should figure prominently in our thinking. Any education that tends to separate people further, to categorize people in unnecessary ways is not only dangerous, but evil. Coordination, integration of the learning process for the goals of human beings--this is the goal and the aim of the curriculum of the community junior college.

We call in the second place for a teaching-counseling strategy that restores the centrality of the student--a strategy the great teachers and great counselors have always known. It is surprising, however, how our reward system perpetuates teacher-centered teaching without ever requiring anyone to consider other possibilities. When we admit that neither teaching nor counseling exists unless there is learning, our institutions can indeed be revolutionary.

We know that, in the community of junior colleges across the nation, many have thought about this process. There is no question that, within the community college, more innovative devices have been used for strengthening the teaching-counseling-learning process than in most other institutions. The fact still remains that we have a long way to go. It is discouraging that, in recent years, as we talk about the responsibility of the teacher and counselor for learning, somehow this concept has been misinterpreted to mean that what is advocated is a permissive, laissez-faire situation in which little is expected of the student. Nothing could be further from the truth. This is a system in which everything is expected of the student, but it is equally the responsibility of the teacher to do all he can to make sure that that process goes on. A person might be "educated" without taking much responsibility, but he cannot be educative without taking the essential responsibility for his own growth and development.

In the third place, this new independence, this new thinking of what we are all about, calls for a management system that facilitates the development

of the learning situation and the learning process. We make a terrible error in thinking of management in any other sense, as simply maintaining clean floors and window shades of the right length, and all such things that are only peripheral to the main effort. Too often we get management confused with manipulation of the things of our environment and forget that it relates to what happens to human minds. Teachers and counselors presumably have the greatest opportunity to bring about the changes in student behavior that we call the essence of the educative process. Our role as administrators is to make sure that we provide the environment and the encouragement that will facilitate that process. The best process of management is the one that combines human values with efficient allocation of all resources. It is best when it includes an awareness and acceptance of the goals of the institution and the willingness on the part of the decision-makers to coordinate all the efforts by using meaningful information toward the fulfillment of the goals of the institution.

The management division of the Academy for Educational Development (AED) recently provided some five conclusions on management systems as they relate to facilitating the educational process, which, to repeat, is our major goal. The AED concluded, first, that the continuing increase in the rate and type of change--economic, cultural, political, technological, and attitudinal--have all created more complex, interrelated managerial systems. Management is more difficult because we live in a more complex world. Second, despite significant improvement in management capabilities, many organizations are relatively less able to cope with their problems than they were ten years ago. This managerial lag is affecting performance and contributing to the diminishing public confidence and support. Third, the traditional style and methods of management are no longer responsive to current requirements. Fourth, to solve the communications crisis, management must be supported by a system of communication that will provide coordinated intelligence and information when and where needed so that managers can reach and maintain agreement. Fifth, when an organization is committed to management by objectives, planning becomes more important, is more difficult, requires a different technique, and serves a different purpose. Dynamic planning provides the means for improved communications to support participative management. To add a sixth conclusion (one that has probably occurred to all at this conference), as we move more and more to larger community colleges, where 10,000 and 20,000 students are not unusual, these problems become greatly exaggerated. The problem of having the kind of information we need and knowing how to use it becomes tremendously complex. The only answer to this is a decentralization that permits all questions and answers to be resolved at the appropriate level closest to the point of action.

Despite the new curriculum that relates to the needs and desires of the people being served, a new strategy for teaching and counseling, and a new management system that facilitates administration so that the basic purposes of the institution can best be served, above all other considerations in declaring our independence and our new philosophy, is a reassessment of what we believe about human beings, the people we serve. What we say about so many of the issues we mentioned earlier--open-door admissions, bringing the college to the community and the community to the college, all of those things near and dear to the hearts of community college educators--will be sounding brass and tinkling cymbals unless we incorporate a belief about human beings that overrides all other considerations. D. Eldon Thresher, in a pamphlet entitled "Uses and

Abuses of Scholastic Aptitude and Achievement Tests," published by the College Entrance Examination Board, says: "There is no such thing as an unfit or unqualified seeker after education." If you believe that, you will indeed free yourself, declare yourself independent from many of the old chains that made you slow in producing the kind of programs needed--or apologetic if you did. If you believe with Thresher that there is no such thing as an unfit or unqualified seeker after education, you will have gone far to declare yourself the independent manager of a great enterprise, a role that you are probably seeking as you enter your particular aspect of the new life as a community college administrator. We will moreover free ourselves to overcome many of the objections being leveled generally at higher education and specifically at community junior college education.

A recent report of the College Entrance Examination Board suggests that the very nature of the community junior college enterprise has failed because it has not thoroughly believed in what it has preached about open-door admission, and in what this means in terms of beliefs and values for human beings. It suggests that the very ones for whom the junior college presumes to have made greatest headway in educational opportunity simply do not see it that way, and that the public at large has been critical of both its promise and performance. As a consequence, the community college has failed to win the support that it had come to expect.

Our stated intentions in the form of new curricula and our innovative ways of improving teaching-learning strategy will be meaningless unless we reassess and rethink what Thresher has said, "There is no such thing as an unfit or unqualified seeker after education." We hope this conference will provide many opportunities to consider this belief--because on it can be based a meaningful declaration of independence. It is such an independence, intertwined with an unswerving faith in the people we serve, that makes administration in the community junior college so richly rewarding and so beneficial in the promotion of the aims of American society.

PRESIDENT-BOARD RELATIONSHIPS:

BUILDING A BRIDGE OF COMMUNICATION

Leslie Koltai

The title of my presentation, "President-Board Relationships: Building a Bridge of Communication," is indeed significant, but, before we begin the discussion, it is important to inspect the bridge of communication that now exists between fellow presidents. It is at seminars such as this that community college presidents and administrators may benefit from the successes and failures of their contemporaries.

At one time or another, we have all been guilty of filling our reports and conversations with glowing accounts of our educational achievements, carefully relegating our less than stupendous endeavors to a less visible position. This is unfortunate, for some of man's most important progress has been achieved by carefully noting what didn't work. When we talk in terms of successful communication, we must, of necessity, talk about the total picture.

First of all, I should like to remind us all of the tremendous need to review the total community college picture, its goals, directions, and organization. Interestingly enough, other people in and out of our field suggest the same.

Recently, when I visited the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, I lunched with Mr. Hutchins and the senior fellow of the Center. Mr. Hutchins, whose comments during the last four or five decades have supplied doctoral candidates with the appropriate quotations for their dissertations, concluded in 1973 that the community college is something to look at as a worthwhile segment of higher education and, furthermore, that the Center would be interested in devoting time and effort (not money) to the topic.

This is important and most timely. The idea of free or low-cost, quality postsecondary education today permeates the thoughts of millions of people who would like to obtain education within their means. This principle makes our community colleges a vital force in our nation.

Max Lerner--scholar, political scientist, and journalist--spoke at Kansas City and recounted an experience in Warsaw, Poland, shortly after the publication of his book, America as a Civilization.

One evening, the chairman of a meeting Mr. Lerner was attending asked, "Mr. Lerner, you have written this big book on American civilization, but we haven't had a chance to have it translated as yet. Could you tell us in a single word what is the essence of American civilization?"

Mr. Lerner replied, "But this is a book of a thousand pages. You want me to distill a thousand pages into one word?" He reported that he thought very fast and very hard about this difficult assignment. He asked himself: Is the word freedom, is it democracy, is it equality, is it tolerance, is it decency, is it justice, is it enterprise?"

Suddenly the word came to him and he heard himself saying, "The word is access, for access is the essence of our American civilization."

Community colleges provide access to knowledge, access to teachers who instruct and inspire, and access to career choices that only a two-year college education makes possible.

We and our boards should keep this in the right perspective, especially when we feel that individual board members would not understand the mission of community colleges in our civilization. No chief executive can ignore the tremendous task of communicating to the board of open-door education.

A prerequisite to effective and efficient communication is the type of image we project to our governing board. When I say image, I am not speaking in terms of the Madison Avenue advertising image. Rather, I am talking about developing a bona fide relationship of mutual trust and respect. The board will not demonstrate a cooperative spirit if it feels we are being less than honest, nor can it be expected to act on advice that appears less than competent. To be convincing, to achieve our purpose, we must:

1. consistently demonstrate a freedom from special interests. (The board must trust us.)

2. produce recommendations based on thoroughly researched, comprehensive reports. (The board must respect each of us as a professional and as a leader.)

We must first realize that communication is not and cannot be an exact discipline. The process of communication can sometimes be compared with the process of education. Most of us have been classroom instructors at one time or another, and realize that each student is different, that he will learn most effectively in different modes of study. The governing board is much the same, in that each member will understand our presentations in varying degrees according to the mode of explanation we employ. In achieving consistently good communication we should follow a pattern of experimentation. Let me give you three examples.

First, review your past presentations. Which of them met with the greatest success? As you appeared before the board, what phrase, what concept, what mode of communication met with the greatest and most positive response? Conversely, what met with the least? As you write the new presentation, take note of these past experiences. Far too often, you may be foolishly consistent in your communication endeavors. You must be aware of the board's reaction and ready to modify your method.

Second, after you have made the presentation, ask the members of your board what information they felt was most valuable. What should have been amplified? What should have been supplied that wasn't?

Third, when you return to your office, re-evaluate the presentation. Each board member is viewing your ideas through a different frame of reference. That

being the case, you will have to evaluate the presentation on the basis of what he understood, what he thought was important, what he considered to be the key element. You probably understood the presentation perfectly. In your eyes it was perfectly logical, perhaps even obvious. I have one key piece of advice: don't count on it. People understand (conceptualize) according to their past experiences and their present circumstance. Since this is often different from your own, it is necessary to take time, to step aside, and to view things as the individual board members do.

I am reminded of a failure in communication I once observed in one of the college libraries. A sign, very neatly printed, was hanging on the inside of one back door. It read:

EMERGENCY EXIT ONLY

NOT TO BE USED UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE!!

Although the individual who lettered the sign knew exactly what he wanted to say, and although the message was generally understood, its clarity was certainly subject to question.

Another such example exists in the personnel manual of a bureaucracy—which will remain un-named. In a section on resignations, it reads as follows:

> If an employee should resign while enjoying the benefits of sick leave, there will be a mandatory period of two weeks before the resignation will become final.
>
> If an employee should die while enjoying the benefits of sick leave, then the mandatory two-week period will be waived and the resignation would be considered to be final.

Certainly the people writing this personnel manual felt totally secure about the effectiveness of their communication, but such a statement mitigates the seriousness with which an individual will view the rest of the document.

As we prepare to advocate a particular idea or course of action, we should ask ourselves five questions as we develop the communication:
ask

1. Why are we making the presentation?
2. Whom are we making the presentation to?
3. What are we attempting to communicate?
4. When should we communicate?
5. How should we communicate?

These questions should be carefully considered and applied to each individual situation. Their answers will vary from issue to issue. Allow me to explain.

1. Why are we making the presentation? Or, perhaps more precisely, what reaction do we wish to evoke from the board? Is it an informative report or a report for action? It is amazing the number of reports that begin and end with no apparent direction. We must state the purpose of our communication and lead the board to our desired conclusion.

Why we are communicating with the board also has to do with the attitude we hold toward the board. Many college presidents consider their governing board a sort of opposition and communicate with it only because it is a fiscal necessity. This creates tension on both sides and closes effective channels of communication.

College governance by the way is, or should be, based on the principle of shared authority. It has no place for anything but complete cooperation and trust. This is the basis of any good partnership agreement and of effective communication. It must be realized that the board is responsible for representing the needs of society. It cannot delegate the responsibility for educational policies and practices in terms of society's needs. It is the final authority--and the source of whatever authority we exercise. The advice of the board must be accepted graciously, not merely followed in a grudging manner.

2. Whom are we making the presentation to? We must begin to view the board as individuals--individuals with different likes and dislikes, varying political philosophies, specialized interests, and differing prides and prejudices. To create this feeling of empathy, some basic principles must be kept in mind. For example:

a. Recognize that every board member has a personal, unique, individual filter through which he or she perceives reality. It is made up of attitudes, prejudices, and countless experiences.

b. Be willing to allow the board member the right to be himself and to see reality in his own way. This doesn't mean we must necessarily like his point of view, just that we do not insist that the whole board think exactly as we do.

c. Only to the degree that the first two steps have been taken can a president proceed to put himself in the board member's shoes and see how the problem looks from there. Of course this can never be done perfectly, as we can never completely set aside our own point of view, but the entire process of communication between the board and the chief executive can be strengthened and enriched only to the degree that those communicating do grasp or understand the various elements of the decision-making process of which they are part. Empathy does not mean acceptance of the board's viewpoint, but only the development of an increased understanding of how the board is seeing the situation.

This is the key element in any communication endeavor. We cannot explain, persuade, or otherwise communicate unless we understand the total board and the individual members' interests, attitudes, and character. This is all part of effectively analyzing the board.

3. What are we attempting to communicate? Many presentations fall short by not clearly defining the subject matter to be dealt with. Often the chief executive, in an effort to be complete, will dump into his presentation all the minutiae he can find. Then, so as not to be pushie, he will not draw conclusions or provide even a summary. The effect of these good intentions is usually disaster.

We must provide the board with the information, the framework, and the analysis from which it can make a viable decision. The board is counting on our expertise and our recommendations. It does not have the staff or the time to perform our job for us.

On the other side of the coin, there is the communicator who provides nothing but his opinion in summary or recommendation form. This, too, is less than satisfactory. Finding the proper balance requires experimentation. Each board and each board member will require something slightly different. It is our business to find out what those information parameters are, so that we can display our case most efficiently.

4. When should we communicate? Far too often, we attempt to communicate with the board only when something is wrong or when something is needed. At such times, the board feels pressured by the immediacy of the claims, and, under such pressure, personalities flare and a decision may be delayed or unwisely made.

We can avoid this simply by keeping the board posted on our activities. If an emergency does occur, the board is more likely to feel cooperative, in that it has not been shut out from the district's activities. Constant communication also gives the necessary opportunities to find the most efficient communications route.

In multi-unit districts, one of the best ways of keeping the channels open is through the chancellor or superintendent. He has constant access to the board members and provides a reliable means of distributing information. The chancellor is also a good source of information on the board's disposition toward any given matter. Keeping him informed achieves both guidance and effective communication with the board.

5. How should we communicate? In this age of instructional innovation (audiovisual aids, not to mention the Xerox copier), people still "lecture" to the board as if it were sitting on a log and the speakers were wearing robes like Socrates'. Such pre-printing-press ideas must be done away with. It should be noted that a person remembers only 15% of what he hears and 85% of what he sees.

We have a message here!

Presentations should be backed up with slides, charts, videotapes, handouts, overhead projections, demonstrations, anything that will bring the idea to life. We have the means at our disposal. We must make use of them.

In summary, my statements on communicating with the board have been the need for extensive preparation. It is a very difficult job, for we must transform the abstract into the real, the idea into the implemented, functioning program.

Follow your intuition when constructing the educational programs of the future, but communicate that idea only after asking yourself:

1. Why am I making this presentation?
2. Whom am I making it to?
3. What am I attempting to communicate?
4. When should it be communicated?
5. How should it be communicated?

The answers will provide the key to the unfolding of your educational blueprint.

I shall close with a few quotations from Stuart Marsee, President-Superintendent of El Camino College, who sums up one of the "joys" of being a college president--the difficulty of communicating:

> If he forms a committee, he can't make decisions; if not, he is dictatorial.
>
> If he writes a bulletin, he is trying to hoodwink the faculty; if not, his communications are poor.
>
> If he prints a bulletin, it is a slick publication and an extravagance; if it is mimeographed, it is amateurish. (He wonders if it is read in either case.
>
> If he visits classes and committee meetings, he is an intruder; if he doesn't, he is not interested.
>
> If he is popular with the community and the board, he is a politician; if not, he has poor public relations.

Like so many other duties, communication is never an easy task; it is only necessary.

THE HUMAN SIDE OF MANAGEMENT:

APPLICATIONS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

James H. Nelson

Since my topic, "The Human Side of Management," clearly implies at least one other side of management, I should like to clarify the meaning of "management" as used in this paper. For this presentation, it will be viewed as the process of getting things done through and with people. In singling out this particular meaning, I make no pretence at comprehensiveness of definition, but the meaning I am giving to the term is commonly a part of more formal definitions.

Let us consider the first part of this definition--getting things done--for there can be little argument about its importance. Any organization exists for specific purposes, i.e., to achieve certain ends or particular goals. This is sometimes referred to as the task, production, or achievement side of management and few managers fail to recognize its importance. Business and industry have always been conscious of the production implications of management, but today there is a heightened consciousness among educational administrators of the organizational results they are achieving. Every trend suggests that accountability pressures will keep the "results" side of management sharply in focus during the coming decade.

The other side of management deals with the question of how results are achieved, i.e., working through and with people. It is unlikely that any manager would deny the importance of this aspect of management in achieving organizational goals. Nevertheless, it seems that the human side of management in education suffers from "benign neglect." It appears that much of what we do to develop or to improve the human side of management in education is "reactive" and intended to counter pressures being directed at management. Thus, well-conceived plans, rationales, and strategies for improving the human side of management on a long-term basis are rare and, in their place, one finds an unwarranted reliance on manipulation of salary, fringe benefits, and conditions of employment. The thesis of this paper is that community college managers have available to them conceptual resources from the applied behavioral science field that could be used to strengthen the human side of community college management. The remainder of this paper will describe some of the applied behavioral science concepts with potential for improving community college management that have been used extensively in the private sector during the past decade.

A few years ago, The Conference Board, an independent, nonprofit business research organization, surveyed a cross-section of North American business firms to determine how widely behavioral science concepts were being applied in these companies.[1] A total of 302 firms cooperated in the study, which included the

---

[1] The Conference Board Report entitled Behavioral Science Concepts and Management Application, authored by Mr. Harold M.F. Rush, is acknowledged as the primary source of the material used in this paper.

following question: "Have any particular behavioral scientists' writings, theories, teaching, or research influenced you personally?" The survey then asked respondents which behavioral scientists had influenced them. Here are some of the findings of this study and their implications for community college management.

Of the 302 respondents to the above question, 68% said they had been influenced by particular behavioral scientists. [Before reporting which behavioral scientists had influenced the study respondents, the speaker asked the audience to write down not more than five names of behavioral scientists who had influenced them and their view of the human side of management. About half of the group wrote down one or more names, none of which overlapped with the six cited most frequently in The Conference Board study. Presumably, the half of the group that wrote no names were not personally influenced by the behavioral scientists or were unaware of any such influence.]

Although 202 behavioral scientists were cited who had influenced one or more of the 302 respondents, only six names were listed by fifty or more respondents, distinguishing them from the others. The six are listed below in rank order.

Behavioral Scientist	No. of Times Listed
Douglas McGregor	134
Frederick Herzberg	96
Rensis Likert	88
Chris Argyris	85
Abraham Maslow	54
Robert Blake and/or Jane S. Mouton	52

Why were these six listed so frequently? What did they contribute that caused private sector managers to acknowledge their influence? Are their contributions applicable to the management or administration of community colleges? Are they being systematically applied there and, if not, do they have the potential to improve the human side of community college management if seriously applied? These questions will be dealt with in the remainder of the paper.

Douglas McGregor

In considering the contributions of the six behavioral scientists who have most influenced business and industry, let us begin with Douglas McGregor. He is best known for his "Theory X and Theory Y" assumptions about people and for the development of their implications for management style. McGregor contended that many managers behave as though their managerial actions were guided by the following assumptions about those whom they manage--the Theory X assumptions:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.

2. Because of man's dislike of work, he must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment to get him to put forth adequate effort toward achievement of organizational objectives.

3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, and wants security above all.

McGregor believed that such assumptions account for the development of many structures, policies, and practices commonplace in today's organizations. According to him, managers have confused consequences with cause and effect. He views the Theory X assumptions as merely demonstrating what happens to people when such a philosophy of management prevails, whereas Theory X managers explain poor performance because of assumed human characteristics.

The core assumptions of McGregor's Theory Y position are:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means of getting men to work toward the organization's objectives. Men will exercise self-direction and self-control toward achieving objectives to which they are committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement (esteem and self-actualization, for example).

4. Average human beings learn, under proper conditions, not only to accept, but to seek responsibility.

5. Most people are capable of a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving organizational problems.

6. Under the conditions of contemporary industrial life [I would substitute the word "organizational" for industrial], the average person's potentialities are being used only partially.

Clearly, McGregor's Theory Y assumptions are optimistic and humanistic. Their power lies in tapping that great resource he says is in each of us--the need to be self-motivated and self-controlled. He has drawn on the work of Abraham Maslow, which will be discussed later in this paper.

Among those facets of management most directly affected by application of McGregor's Theory Y assumptions are control (locus shifts from external to internal control); flexibility (Theory X locks management into rigid positions where Theory Y permits, even demands, great flexibility); participation (McGregor believes that participation is vital in achieving commitment of individuals to the organization's objectives); and authority (McGregor does not discount the importance of legitimate authority for effective management, but he cautions that authority is only one tool and is best used where commitment to the organization's objectives cannot be otherwise obtained.)

Frederick Herzberg

Now for a brief consideration of the work of Frederick Herzberg, which has attracted the attention of business and industrial managers. He is best known for his "motivation-hygiene" theory and its "satisfiers" and "dissatifiers" concepts. Herzberg's study has led him to conclude that motivation can best be explained as a two-dimensional rather than as a bi-polar phenomenon. In his work, he found one set of factors that appear able to influence employees' motivation negatively, i.e., employees become dissatisfied if these factors or conditions are not met. However, the same factors do not have the power to motivate employees positively if they are met. In other words, they were dissatisfiers or potential dissatisfiers. Among these factors were organizational policy and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, job security, and personal life.

A second set of factors revealed by Herzberg's study appeared to have the power to satisfy or motivate employees positively. These satisfiers include such things as achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. The crucial question for managers, assuming Herzberg's findings to be true (they are corroborated to some extent by the work of Abraham Maslow), is how can the use of satisfiers be optimized? How can emphasis be shifted from the dissatisfiers (salaries, fringe benefits, etc.) to satisfiers?

Unfortunately, some educators have tended to minimize the significance of the Herzberg findings on the assumption that they might be applicable in an industrial or business setting (because of the routine and boredom of many jobs there), but were not applicable in an educational setting (because of the intrinsically satisfying nature of the work educators perform). To such naysayers, I suggest that the factors of achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth are just as important in education as in business and industry--a point that Herzberg's later study, which included educators, seems to verify.

Rensis Likert

Let us consider now the work that has made Rensis Likert well-known among business and industrial managers. The two principles for which he is best known in the private sector are the "linking pin" and "interaction-influence." These two principles, though conceptually separate, are closely related. The idea of the linking pin can be illustrated by thinking of each manager (except the very highest and lowest levels of management) as being on two management teams. In one of these, the individual is the manager of others. In the other team, he

is one of several peers who are responsible to a common manager. Because of this dual role, he becomes a "linking pin" between the two units of management. The importance of the linking-pin concept in organizational communication is readily seen, but the team emphasis implied by it is not so apparent. Likert sees the linking-pin person relating to all of those whom he manages as a team rather than as a series of one-to-one relationships with each individual he manages. The team-management emphasis that has received considerable attention of late is creditable in large part to the work and concepts of Rensis Likert.

Likert's interaction-influence principle states that a manager's authority in the group of individuals he manages is directly related to the influence these individuals perceive him as having upon the next higher level of management in the organization. Thus, Likert sees authority as flowing upward in the organization rather than downward. The amount of influence that the manager exerts upward and laterally in the organization determines the influence he can exert downward. The more clout a manager is perceived to have with his peers and boss, the more likely it is that those he manages will carry out his directives.

The pivotal variable in Likert's work is the superior-subordinate relationship and he expands on this relationship in four basic leadership styles, which he labels "Exploitive-Authoritative," "Benevolent-Authoritative," "Consultative," and "Participative-Group." As these labels suggest, the four styles range from hierarchical and authoritative to highly participative. It is the participative style that Likert associates with high productivity and good organizational health.

Chris Argyris

The next behavioral scientist I will discuss briefly is Chris Argyris. A major theme underlying his work is the conflict of organizational needs and individual needs. Basically, since Argyris views organizations as "inhibitors of people," he seeks to develop ways to accomplish an integration of organizational and individual needs. He sees human problems as arising out of conditions within organizations and therefore his basic orientation is toward finding ways of changing organizations. He views the laboratory training group with its face-to-face exchange opportunities as the most effective means of developing "leveling and candor," which he regards as essential to good organizational health.

Argyris has advanced what he calls "The Mix Model" as a conceptual base for organizational change. In it, he has postulated the existence of six dimensions or essential properties of organizations. He then considers organizational health in terms of the extent to which an organization moves away from or toward these six properties. The Mix Model is presented below in summary form.

A MIX MODEL

Away from the Essential Properties	Toward the Essential Properties
1. One part controls the whole	1. The whole is created and controlled through the interrelationship of all parts
2. Awareness of plurality of parts	2. Awareness of pattern of parts
3. Achieving objectives related to the parts	3. Achieving objectives related to the whole
4. Unable to influence its internally-oriented core activities	4. Able to influence the internally-oriented core activities "it" desires
5. Unable to influence its externally-oriented core activities	5. Able to influence the externally-oriented core activities "it" desires
6. Nature of core activities influenced by the present	6. Nature of core activities influenced by past, present, and future

One important issue inherent in Argyris' model is the locus or source of power and influence within organizations. He sees the equalization and distribution of power and influence within an organization as essential to its health. Other characteristics he ascribes to the healthy organization are awareness of overall goals, open communication, mutual understanding of functions and roles, and openness to change.

Argyris has also expounded the view that authority is related to expertise and should therefore be expected to shift as the competencies or expertise required by the organization changes. He advocates a related view of work groups in which the "one man-one boss" concept would be supplanted by ad hoc work groups whose composition would change as skill and competence requirements changed.

Abraham Maslow

Let us now consider Abraham Maslow's concepts of motivation as applied by business and industrial managers. Maslow's concept of motivation is based upon what he terms a "hierarchy of needs." These needs range from the basic (man's physiological needs) to the highest level (the need for self-actualization). According to Maslow, before any need in the hierarchy can become active in motivating an individual, all of the lower-level needs must be satisfied. Once satisfied, those needs no longer have the power to motivate an individual, although that power returns to them if lower-level needs are threatened.

Two of the most important understandings derived from Maslow's work are (1) the lack of motivating power of a satisfied need and (2) the high-order motivational power of individuals' need for self-actualization. The former helps to explain why employees who have received substantial satisfaction of security and safety needs are no longer motivated by these (unless they are threatened), but concentrate instead on such higher-level needs as esteem and self-actualization. The latter focuses on the potency of an individual's desire for growth and development as a source of motivation. One can readily see similarities between Maslow's work and that of McGregor and Herzberg. To some extent the work of Likert and Argyris also resembles parts of Maslow's.

Robert Blake

The last of the six behavioral scientists judged influential by The Conference Board Study respondents is Robert Blake (or Jane S. Mouton). The work of Blake and Mouton that has attracted the greatest attention among business and industrial managers is what they call "The Managerial Grid." They have conceptualized management as a two-dimensional process, i.e., "concern for people" and "concern for production." The "Grid" is achieved by placing concern for people on a nine-point vertical scale and concern for production on a nine-point horizontal scale. The result is an eighty-one-cell grid, on which one can place himself (or others) by managerial priorities on concern for people versus concern for productivity.

Blake and Mouton have identified five combinations of concern for "people and productivity" that effectively illustrate the grid. First, there is the manager who has a minimal concern for both people and production (he is a 1,1 on the grid). He just wants to survive and represents what Blake and Mouton have labeled "impoverished management." Then there is the 9,1 who is concerned only about productivity and represents a caricature of the old-time autocrat. In the center of the grid is the 5,5 who is moderately concerned about both people and productivity, but whose compromises prevent him from being truly effective in either area. Next, there is the 1,9 whose preoccupation as a manager is to keep everybody happy on the assumption that they will then produce like "contented cows." Blake and Mouton label this combination "country club management." Finally, there is the 9,9 who integrates a maximum concern for people with a maximum concern for achievement or productivity. This type of manager assumes that people want to be productive and that organizational goals can be meshed with individual goals.

Obviously, The Managerial Grid cannot improve managers simply because they are aware of it, but it can provide a systematic way of examining one's managerial style and of modifying it. Organizations that have worked with the Managerial Grid Program, which includes a series of integrated managerial and organizational development components, have generally reported positive results.

The Johari Window

Finally, I should like to present one additional contribution of the applied behavioral scientists, because it represents a systematic framework for giving and receiving feedback about oneself. Such an exchange of feedback is vitally important for managerial success in the human side of management, regardless of where one manages. This feedback model was conceived by Joseph Luft

and Harry Ingham and is named the Johari Window after its creators. It appears below in schematic form.[2]

THE JOHARI WINDOW:

A MODEL FOR SOLICITING AND GIVING FEEDBACK

S-E-L-F

———— Solicits Feedback ————

G-R-O-U-P Self-Disclosure —— Gives Feedback ——

Things They Know \ Things I Know	Things I Know	Things I Don't Know
Things They Know	Arena	Blindspot
Things They Don't Know	Facade	Unknown

The four areas of the window pictured above are the (1) Arena, which represents what one knows oneself that is also known by others; (2) Blindspot, which represents those things that are not known by oneself but are known by others; (3) Facade, which represents things known by oneself that are not known by others; and (4) Unknown, which represents things known by neither oneself nor others. By systematically soliciting and giving feedback, it is possible to expand the Arena, thus reducing those troublesome areas where guessing games are played. As in the case of The Managerial Grid, just being aware of the Johari Window does little to increase the area of mutual awareness, but it provides a framework for making the effort.

In concluding this presentation, I offer the following points for consideration by those who seek to improve the human side of community college management:

---

[2] The schematic of the Johari Window has been adapted from The 1973 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators authored by Jones and Pfeiffer.

1. Applied behavioral science has provided concepts, principles, and models with the potential for improving the human side of management.

2. Managers in business and industry have been drawing on the conceptual capital of behavioral scientists for many years and such application is increasing.

3. Managers of educational enterprises appear to have been less influenced by the work of behavioral scientists and are less likely to apply such concepts systematically.

4. Industry takes a long-term view of the money spent to improve management. It is regarded as an investment in human resources that will facilitate achievement of its goals.

5. The views of many educational managers (and boards) vary from regarding money spent on improved managerial skills as unnecessary to viewing it as downright irresponsible. Some, of course, share the view that money spent on it will bring a return to the organization.

6. Although businesses and industries such as Texas Instruments are large enough to justify having specialized talent within their organizations, they are also more willing to recognize their need for outside expertise than are their educational counterparts. Educational organizations, like private-sector organizations, could improve the human side of management by wise use of outside consultants in management and organizational development.

STATE, REGIONAL, AND NATIONAL SYSTEMS OF EDUCATION: COORDINATION OR CONTROL?

James L. Wattenbarger

A volume edited by James A. Perkins, called "Higher Education from Autonomy to Systems," is a series of lectures that were presented over the Voice of America explaining higher education to the people of the world. The theme of this particular volume was that we in the United States have moved from emphasis on individual institutions to emphasis on state systems in higher education. We have also moved into many types of regionally cooperative systems and, in certain ways, have developed a national system of higher education. You may remember that Thomas Jefferson, in his conversations with DuPont de Nemours, discussed the development of a national system for higher education in the United States.

In spite of the absence of any reference to education in the United States Constitution, the federal government has maintained a continuous interest in all levels of education, including higher education.

Another monograph, entitled "Governing the State Education Systems: Pressures, Problems, and Options," redefined the entire organization of education in the states in systems terms and pointed out that the results may be predicted through our knowledge of systems. More often than not, we also recognize, with Lyman Glenny, that a number of anonymous decision-makers in higher education with real power are not entirely unknown but are unrecognized by most people. These decision-makers often have more influence on the final action than the professional and state leadership. Their decisions on budgets, planning, allocating resources, and determining which quality controls are to be used often cannot be specifically identified. We wonder when, where, and how the decision was made and may find that we cannot contact our anonymous antagonist. The power may not be in the boards or even the president of the new faculty unions.

One thing is very clear, however. State systems of community colleges have become the normally expected avenue for community college growth and development. More states now plan from a state-level point of view than was true even two years ago.

Three characteristics of state systems cause the conflicts in decision-making processes. First of all, most state systems are made up of a multiple group of institutions and some of them have multiple purposes. Secondly, these multiple institutions in varying ways are really in competition with each other and some of this competition will increase within a few states. Colleges are now in competition for students, for example, as was not the case during the '60s. They are competing for assignment of responsibilities in programs. At the university level, in particular, they compete for assignment of research, for accomplishment of research activities, and for faculty. They are very much in competition with each other for prestige and status within the system. The third characteristic is that these multiple institutions, in competition with each other, all depend on the same state legislature for money. Even the charging of student fees is authorized by an action of the state legislature

in many, if not most, states. The state legislature becomes the focal point of this competition for power.

In the midst of all these influences, some traditional concepts appear to be antithetical to these apparent trends. One such concept is the theory of institutional autonomy, that is, the right of a college to control its own destiny. Perhaps this is an imagined concept that has never really existed anyway, but most of us on the faculty are convinced it was a viable concept and most of us now feel that its demise is impending. When we look at the broader picture, however, we can see why this demise seems imminent. Education as a part of society should be operated in the best interest of the students, the faculty, the administrators, the government, and the public at large. This harmonizing activity is usually interpreted as an attempt to denigrate the autonomy of the institutions. The current need for planning on a level higher than a single institution is obvious even to the privately-supported colleges who bind themselves together most often these days in some type of consortium and many associations.

The recent development of legislative planning agencies has been mentioned, as has the increased planning activities of the executive branch of the government. The result of these activities has been an increasing emphasis on establishing systems of postsecondary educational institutions. These systems have resulted, in almost all states, in establishing the office of the state director of community colleges with some sort of board working with him.

The title for this person varies considerably from state to state. In some states he is called state director, or even executive secretary. Whatever the title, the essential elements in his responsibilities have been moving toward similarity.

The office is still in the developmental stage in over half the states, but in several states operational experience has now accumulated for some 15 to 20 years. The role of the state director has been best defined by operational techniques and activities in such states as Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Virginia, and Washington, but the role is not defined alike in all of them. On the other hand, the role has become less well defined in such states as Hawaii, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, and Texas, where at one time there was a definable role that has become very hazy within the past two years. The role of the state director still is developing in such states as Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, and Tennessee. The other states fall somewhere in between these roles, depending on several factors: the number of community colleges in the state, the state laws under which they operate, the structure that is found in those states, and the sophistication of the planning and budgetary processes at the state level.

Wayne Hall, in 1968, attempted to describe the role of the state director and his functions. The bases for authority and responsibility Hall listed at that time are not too different from the ones we might talk about even today. He said, first of all, that the state director should provide leadership as an articulate state spokesman in promoting a comprehensive community college program. Secondly, he should provide leadership in developing, defining, and coordinating a statewide community college plan. Thirdly, he should aid in

defining the roles and functions of the community colleges and establish criteria for approving the establishment of new colleges. Fourth, he should provide and coordinate statewide community college research, and encourage and coordinate research in local community colleges. Fifth, he should advise, recommend, and consult with state officials and legislators to promote improvement of the community college legislation and finance. Sixth, he should prepare, define, and present the junior college budget at the state level. Seventh, he should advise and consult with local junior college officials, particularly on legislation, finance, and budget. Eighth, he is responsible for maintaining community college standards of quality and administering state board policies.

This is an inclusive and comprehensive assignment of responsibilities. State directors do not have all of them. The major theme running through them, however, is that the state director must assume a role of leadership. He must be a prime mover in the development of a master plan. He must serve as a principal state coordinator and a key state spokesman for a community college program within the state. In carrying out these responsibilities, he should consider his major responsibility to be providing leadership in designing and implementing the junior college master plan. It seems that this is his major function. If he does that job, he will have no time to do anything else. In accordance with the master plan is the large responsibility of the state director to bring together harmoniously the bodies of statewide coordination and the vigor of local control and responsibility.

Many of the effects of planning and coordination, as differentiated from supervision, are expressed in regulations. This means that the state board or the agency responsible for directing the state director has considered the elements essential to the effectiveness of his position. The nature and function of his position must be specifically defined if he is going to be an active leader. Ample authority and responsibility should be assigned to the position. All the community college state-level responsibilities should be coordinated through this one office, not through a dozen different offices. The position should never be involved in any sort of partisan politics. The state officer should have direct organizational access, with commensurate authority and status, to the state board responsible for community colleges. In other words, the state director cannot be effective if he is in a third- or fourth-echelon position. He must have adequate staff and other support. His preparation for the job should also be considered.

We have just completed a study of state directors in the fifty states. We asked a number of questions about responsibilities and authority and this study makes it clear that the position of the state director cannot be considered a detail job. He cannot be involved in small details if he is to be an effective state director. He must be an individual with a very special skill, and a thorough knowledge of systems and how they operate. He also needs to understand higher education and community colleges as they relate to the total program of postsecondary education. He must have specific skills associated with the planning process.

We asked the directors what responsibility they find most rewarding. This, in order of preference, is what they replied: The most rewarding activity was working with the community colleges and with the universities; second, with

systemwide planning and development activities; third, working with the state board of trustees; fourth, working with the legislature; and fifth, working with public relations.

We have no idea what meanings state directors attach to all these words but it seems clear that the activities they found most rewarding all involved people or working with people in various relationships. This means that the state director has to be a person who enjoys and has the ability to work with people.

We also asked them what responsibilities they found to be most frustrating. They reported that the most frustrating was keeping the budget. Next came lack of authority for change, red tape and bureaucracy, and lack of institutional appreciation.

We asked them how they spent their time. They reported that most of their time was spent in collegiate, legislative, and agency meetings. Second, came planning activities; third, reacting to issues; fourth, policy and budget development; fifth, working with the state board; and sixth, public relations.

We asked them what kind of background they considered the best preparation for the responsibilities they held. They listed them in this order: some kind of administrative experience (it seemed to make little difference, in their opinion, what kind of administrative experience) that involved administrative decision-making. Second, they thought that teaching experience was a good background, and third, that doctoral study was helpful.

The final thing we asked them was to describe their long-term professional goal. What did they feel was worth doing in the long run? The first goal, the most important, was to be able to increase their staff. The second one was to improve their own level of accomplishment. The third thing they wanted was to return to a junior college president's job.

This officer, then, becomes the major factor of leadership in a state system of community colleges. Whether we are talking about coordination or control, it depends in large measure on him.

PANEL DISCUSSION ON INSTRUCTION: WHY BE CONCERNED?

James S. Fitzgerald

One of the most impressive moments of my administrative career was as an observer at a meeting with the chancellor of a multi-campus community college district and one of the presidents of the district. The president had come with a request that a campus-level business office not be filled for he preferred to handle campus business matters himself. At that point the chancellor, prehaps over-dramatically, stated: "As president, you are expected to be an instructional leader not a businessman." That moment of observation has become my most overriding administrative philosophy whenever I ask myself, "What did I do today?"

With the myriad duties, pressures, and surprises that occupy the daily life of a community college president, it is no wonder that the development and nurture of a strong instructional program can often be shuffled to a lower rung on the priority list.

In an effort to remind new college presidents of the importance of the instructional program a panel composed of a teacher, a division chairman, a vice president for instruction, and a board member was organized around the topic, "What I Expect of the College President in the Area of Instruction." Perhaps a central theme revolves around the comments from panel members: "Let me do my own thing--but give me the administrative support so that I can do my thing in an excellent manner."

In addition to the panel disscussion, which involved all but one of the participating presidents, each panel member prepared a brief written statement on this topic. The positions papers below were distributed to each participant.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

What a Student Expects of the College President in the Area of Instruction

A student body president at a community college is in a unique position. Usually he has one year to introduce himself and learn to know the top man of the organization, THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT. I put that in caps because he is a separate person on the campus, the person with the final say in most college-wide situations. Before a student body president can feel at ease talking to a college president, he must know that he can walk into his office and feel an atmosphere of friendliness and openness. Then, and only then, can a student body president begin to act on such subjects as instruction on a community college campus.

Students should be given a voice in availability, structure, etc. of the courses offered at their school. This can be done through the student body president by appointing students as voting members of the Curriculum Committee, Evaluation Committee, and so on. Any committees formed

to study problems concerning curriculum should have students on them. Directly or indirectly, this responsibility falls on the shoulders of the college president.

Jim Carson, Associate Student Body President, Orange Coast College

What an Instructor Expects of the College President in the Area of Instruction

It would be easy to say that, as an instructor, I expect the college president to let me do my own thing. After all, what does he know about Zinjanthropus or a Kwakiutl potlatch? But my own thing as an instructor relates to a number of individuals to whom both the college president and I are responsible. Our ultimate responsibility is to provide the best possible education for both the transfer and non-transfer students.

Within the existing structure of Orange Coast College, the president provides the framework for the instructional program. It can't be a we-they dichotomy between the faculty and administration. I can't serve as the college spokesman to the community, a liaison with the board of trustees, a recruiter of faculty members, a formulator of the college budget, a planner of facility needs, etc. While some of these areas seem remote from the daily activities of the classroom, they are real needs that allow me to function to the best of my ability as an instructor.

I expect the college president to assume a role of creative leadership. There is a great difference between leadership and the exercise of authority. Creative leadership is a personal style that no amount of authority can bring about but, by its exercise, a college president can bring about an eager, innovative, and dedicated faculty that makes the job of education a more enjoyable experience for everyone: faculty, administrators, and students.

Dwayne Merry, Professor of Anthropology, Orange Coast College

What a Division Chairman Expects of the College President in the Area of Instruction

My particular perception of the role of president is what I see as his characteristic role: public relations (with community and other campuses, or between campuses in multi-campus districts) and plant management. I personally would not wish to see him directly involved with the instructional program except as it relates to hiring, budget, and facilities.

To avoid top-heavy administration, I would prefer the president to select a strong, well-organized, creative, and flexible dean of instruction and able division chairmen, support them, and leave them alone.

The consequences of not doing so are several. The president must also maintain some formal and informal contacts with divisions and individual faculty, so that he can know and possibly represent those interests in the community, at district levels of administration, and on other campuses. Furthermore, I believe it imperative to campus morale and harmony that he be visible and appear available to staff and students alike.

If one accepts my premise that curriculum and instructional development should emanate primarily from sources closest to it, it appears that the president could best aid the development and maintenance of a vital, sound, and creative curriculum and instructional program by fostering a climate conducive to them. This, to me, means an atmosphere wherein the "doers" (at the bottom of the organizational chart) are free to develop sound ideas, knowing that they will be heard and, if it is financially feasible, that the ideas will be implemented thoughtfully but without undue bureaucratic hassle. The key to this sort of organization and atmosphere is clarification of the role of the division chairman.

Recent research has shown that in simple campus districts division chairmen are viewed as the key administrators in this regard--the pivotal individuals who represent administrative concerns to staff and students and who represent and implement curriculum and instructional concerns on campus councils. While chairmen are beginning to acquire more responsibility, however, salaries, length of contract, and clerical assistance lag by comparison. This fosters frustration, at best, and, at worst, reinforcement of identification with faculty, perhaps at the expense of cooperation with administration.

In multi-campus districts the problems appear more serious. Here the division chairmen are not seen as administratively important to the success of the operation. The frustrations of insufficient influence appear greater than in the single-campus district, while chairmen are frequently seen by administrators as empire builders or faculty spokesmen (especially when they have been elected). Fears of unionism and collective bargaining increase as signs of them increase. Some districts have, as a consequence, abolished the role of division chairman or severely reduced its importance. Some have chosen an administrative structure of associate deans who manage interdisciplinary clusters. Other districts still founder in confusion. There is perhaps a middle road between these two solutions.

Whatever the solution, it seems critical that the president devote some effort to the clarification of the role of the division chairman in order to foster careful management and creativity at the "doing" level of curriculum and instruction.

Donna Willoughby, Chairman, Division
of Literature and Languages,
Golden West College

What the Dean of Instruction Expects of the College President in the Area of Instruction

Putting down briefly what a dean of instruction expects of a president forces me to come to grips with essentials and, while the list below is far from exhaustive, no list would be complete with these items omitted:

(1) Clear areas of responsibility and authority The degree to which the dean will be his own man in the area of instruction and curriculum is critical. If the president intends to function as the dean of instruction, he should make this known, and the dean can then serve as his administrative assistant. If the president intends that the dean be the instructional leader at the institution, he should provide him with not just the responsibility, but also the authority, to do his job.

(2) Consistency While there will always be some change "at the margin" in the relationship between any two individuals, the president should be consistent in his dealings with the dean; i.e., he should not make him the dean on an issue this month and administrative assistant on a similar issue next month.

(3) Answers Nature abhors a vacuum, and so does good administrative procedure. When the dean has a problem or question that requires the president's attention, he should refer it to the president in a clear, concise, and complete manner, and receive a timely answer. The best answer is "yes," second is "no," third is "I don't know," and fourth is no answer at all.

(4) Communication The president must insure that communication flows freely and openly between himself and the dean of instruction and also between Instruction, Student Personnel, Business, and the President's Office. Both vertical and lateral communication are critical, if the various services of the college are to support and complement each other.

Wallace F. Cohen, Vice President for Instruction, El Camino College

What a Board of Trustees Member Expects of the College President in the Area of Instruction

Board members expect the president to:

(1) hire instructors whose talents and capabilities enhance the existing staff's ability to achieve divisional/departmental objectives and enhance the opportunities to achieve the mission of the community college

(2) set the tone personally (and through deans and chairmen) for a stimulating teaching environment, allocating and using effectively the resources available to support and expand the accomplishments of the instructional staff

(3) encourage and support opportunities for personal and professional growth and development of members of the instruction team

(4) direct a systematic, fair, and judicious program of evaluating members of the instructional staff, providing appropriate recognition for teaching excellence, and initiating affirmative action to correct weak instructional situations.

Worth Keene, Member Board of Trustees,
Coast Community College District

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: SELF-ACTUALIZATION BY GROUP PROCESS

Mildred E. Hight
Robert A. Schley

Rationale

We are at the beginning of a movement characterized by the development and use of a wide variety of group methods designed to tap human potential. Data show that all of us are functioning at a fraction of our potential and that working within groups provides the reinforcement necessary to help us actualize more of our potential.

The "Self-Actualization by Group Process" is a positive growth experience that enables an individual to develop an understanding of his maximum potential, and how it can be used to affirm and accomplish life goals.

The self-actualization process is a personal approach. Each human being is unique, with a maximum potential of his own. Knowing this core, he finds that this uniqueness is the key to effective planning for constructive action.

The self-actualization process is a positive growth experience. Maslow says that "Growth is, in itself, a rewarding and exciting process, e.g., the fulfilling of yearnings and ambitions . . . ." Self-actualizing people enjoy life in general and in practically all its aspects. In addition, continuing growth maintains their interest in future goals.

The process can lead to self-identity, to the identification of a value system, to the development of a positive self-concept, and to the recognition of strengths possessed and potentials to be developed.

Working within a group, structured to be non-interfering, undemanding, and accepting, provides the positive reinforcement necessary to help affirm more of this potential within one's self and heightens awareness of potential in others.

The process is constructed to move each individual through a review of his past to an assessment of his present values, identification and recognition of personal strengths, and into future life-style planning.

The process involves each participant voluntarily, and to whatever depth he desires. The process emphasizes positive, constructive feedback and positive self-awareness.

The self-actualization process gives each participant the opportunity to find who he is, what he is, what he likes, where he is going, what his mission is, and what his plans are for getting there.

Goals and Objectives of the Process

The goals of this process are to provide:

1. a voluntary, non-threatening group atmosphere for a meaningful growth experience

2. an opportunity to develop an understanding by each participant of his own value system, his primary motivators, and how to reinforce them positively

3. an opportunity for developing techniques for goal setting--short-range and long-range goals and life-style planning

4. a vehicle for the assessment of personal, intellectual, and social assets and how to use them positively to reach identified goals

5. an opportunity for each individual to become conscious of, identify, and understand the descriptive and dynamic aspects of himself and his life history

6. a means for each individual to make positive changes in self-esteem, sense of adequacy, and self-acceptance

7. an opportunity for each participant to increase his feelings of warmth, empathy, communication, and meaningful association in interpersonal relations.

Institutional Objectives for Process

As an institution, we have taken the position that an accountability system for an educational institution cannot be developed without identification of significant constraints.

The sample class constraint study showed that an overwhelming majority of instructors identified "lack of motivation of students" as the principal constraint. The self-actualization seminar program was the result of this identification.

The self-actualization process is a highly structured, positively-oriented group process that has as objectives increasing student achievement and increasing teaching effectiveness. It is proposed that the process will increase student achievement by:

1. developing an understanding by each student of his own value system, his primary motivators, and how to reinforce them positively

2. developing techniques for goal setting--short-range and long-range goals and life-style planning

3. providing a vehicle for the assessment of personal, intellectual, and social strengths and how to use them positively to reach identified goals

4. instigating changes in self-perception that will lead to increased motivation

5. increasing satisfactions and positive feedback in interpersonal relations.

It is also proposed that the self-actualization process will contribute to increased effectiveness of instruction by:

1. increasing the instructor's perceptual orientation toward identifying the strengths in each student and toward positively reinforcing them

2. increasing the understanding of the instructor of his own value system and how his classroom instruction and his out-of-class contacts can be enhanced through this understanding

3. providing an objective method of using assessment of values and strengths to define areas of conflict and to resolve them

4. instigating changes in self-perception and perception of others that provide new dimensions to the instructor-student relationship

5. providing the means to bring the college community together with a level of rapport that would permeate the campus and create a warm, receptive college environment.

Summary of College Involvement

The thirty Mt. San Jacinto College faculty members, five administrators, one board member, and fifteen classified staff members who have had training in the self-actualization process are unanimous in evaluating the experience as a genuine learning process that enhances interpersonal relationships, brings into focus new strengths in oneself and in others, and has a positive carry-over in the instructional program.

Our first involvement with the process included three groups of approximately eight students each as volunteers through a Speech 1A class, and one group of volunteer students not involved in a class. The program was conducted as a pilot program, with a matching control group. The students, both the control and pilot study group, took standardized tests of values as a pre-test and took a post-test to determine what change in values had taken place.

Previous research has been conducted, using the same standardized testing, and the self-actualization process has proved effective in influencing positive changes in self-concept and in helping students move significantly in the direction of self-actualization. Research has shown that students become more inner-directed and have an increase in self-regard.

The eight instructors, in teams of two, who led the four pilot student groups were told by the students involved that the experience was meaningful and helpful. Regular class status for the process was approved and we have continued to start volunteer groups when requested by students or other college personnel.

The groups are conducted by college personnel who have been through the process and who work carefully together to stay within its structure. Weekly meetings of the leaders are held to discuss procedures, techniques, and clarification of the process.

In addition to the on-campus involvement with this educational development program, we are organizing and providing the leadership for numerous workshops, involving other community colleges in the state, providing leadership for self-actualization workshops on campuses of individual community colleges (including Hawaii and Arizona), working with organization groups, and providing instructors for classes in self-actualization through the University of California, Riverside.

The general objective of the self-actualization process is to reduce the identified constraints, to increase student retention and student achievement, and thereby to contribute directly to increasing units earned as applied to institutional accountability.

STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Richard D. DeCosmo

Community college student personnel workers have shown an increasing interest in the terminology and style, if not the rubrics, of the human-development movement. They have become student-development specialists, and counseling centers have been renamed growth centers. An examination of the human-development idea, especially in contrast to the more prevalent service model, is essential.

This, however, is not the only trend in community college work. Interest is also growing in what is termed "systematic instruction." More and more teachers and colleges are turning to behavioral objectives, auto-instructional devices, and criterion-based testing.

Both of these phenomena have the same goal: the improvement of the educational enterprise that involves community colleges. Before sides are chosen for what appears to be a battle between humanists and mechanists, the two movements should look at their connections, for there is a basic compatibility between the two.

Human Development: Basic Beliefs

A human development program, simply stated, encourages change in a person in the direction of his potential. In the words of third-force psychologists, it facilitates growth toward self-actualization. It has a behavioral orientation and allows the student freedom and responsibility. The climate should provide challenge, warmth, and the appreciation of individual differences. The basis for such a program, for such an idea, includes three beliefs:

1. Each person has abilities, talents, and capacities far beyond what has been developed. Each person is a gifted person.

2. Each person is in a state of becoming. He is never a "finished product," but is growing, changing, developing. This is his reality--that he is ever in a state of becoming.

3. Each person grows in the direction of his potentialities. "All the evidence that we have . . . indicates that it is reasonable to assume in practically every human being . . . that there is an active will toward health, an impulse toward growth, or toward the actualization of our human potentialities."

These three beliefs lead to the inescapable conclusion that "freeing" is more important than "filling." If we have this propensity toward actualization, it is important to remove the constraints. Filling up a person with a great deal of information in our schools and classes is not as important as freeing the person to learn. The tight strictures, enforcement of rigid discipline and punishment that seem to accompany this "filling" process serve as a block to actualization--they turn one "off" rather than "on."

Human Development vs. Student Service: The Messages

As O'Bannion, Thurston, and Guilden point out in their paper on an emerging model, the most common models have been regulation, maintenance, and therapy. The therapeutic and regulation models have seen better days, but the maintenance model still prevails on our campuses. In this model, student personnel workers are service men.

If we can borrow a "McCluhanism"--the medium is the message--we can examine this model and compare it to a human-development model. Services imply a "doing for" the students--telling him the programs he should enter, the classes he should take, and the number of hours he should work. We admonish him about class attendance and how he spends his financial aid. If he does not mesh with the system, we treat him as maladjusted.

In "helping" him, we communicate to him that we are responsible for his state of repair--we teach him that he is incompetent to make certain decisions--and, in making his decisions for him, we create dependency. Last and most important, we teach him to sit idle while we become involved. We then loudly complain about student apathy. These are the sometimes subtle, sometimes loud, messages we communicate in a service paradigm.

The messages communicated through a human-development model are different from the service or maintenance model. The human-development model emphasizes collaboration: we work with the student, we try to help him develop his ability to do things for himself. Thus, while a service model is behavioral for staff, the human-development model is behavioral for the student. A person's responsibility for himself is emphasized. His competence for making decisions is recognized and enhanced. Independence is encouraged. The target result is self-motivation, since the student decides what he wants to do and makes his own plans for achieving it. All are qualities we have traditionally said are uppermost in our goals for education.

As an interesting and practical pulling-together of the theory related to human development, Arthur Chickering in Education and Identity, builds seven vectors of development:

1. achieving competence (intellectual, physical and manual skills, interpersonal relationships, sense of competence)
2. managing emotions (awareness, integration)
3. becoming autonomous (emotional independence, instrumental independence)
4. establishing identity
5. freeing interpersonal relationships
6. clarifying purpose
7. developing integrity (humanizing values, personalizing values, developing congruence).

When this theoretical framework is considered, one can readily see the value of the emerging model of human development. The statement of these vectors as process relates to our becoming and implies movement and direction.

Human Development and Systematic Instruction

A basic compatibility exists between the emerging human-development programs and the emerging instructional systems. This has been neglected in most of our verbal meanderings to date. Cohen and others are advocating a systems approach to instruction that many in our field see as mechanistic. This is most unfortunate, for what appears to be a promising approach to changing the present monstrous system of educating people is denied the enhancement we can give it. We could help it become what its apologists want it to be rather than what some are trying to make it. As often translated, it becomes a vehicle for repackaging old (even refuted) educational ideas based on repression, regulation, and structuring. It can become freeing and open (though its applications are not always so at present).

It is important to examine the connections between human development and the systems approach to instruction if we are to save both of these desirable developments for our students.

The apologists for this "new" form of learning base much of their thinking on the idea of mastery learning. Bloom states in Learning for Mastery that "we are convinced that the grade A as an index of mastery of a subject can, under appropriate conditions, be achieved by up to 95 percent of the students in a class." This sounds like our previous assumption that every person is a gifted person. Nearly everyone can become competent in whatever area he chooses. The systems-approach people make much of auto-tutorial methods, in which the student manipulates and controls the elements of the learning paradigm. Outcomes, further, must be stated behaviorally--the student must show by his behavior that he has achieved the mastery required. These outcomes emphasize active student involvement and a behavioral approach. The same elements are present in a human-development model. Further, the constraints imposed by instructional methodologies and time are to be removed as blocks to his learning. Last, and most important, punishment and threat of punishment are removed as "motivators," and success and rewards (not competition) are emphasized. These, Bloom feels, improve one's feeling of competence and self-esteem, important aspects of human development. In short, the systems approach tries to facilitate competence, independence, responsibility, and self-motivation where the student is vitally involved in the learning process.

The Practical Relationship

In an ideal learning system, one would have separate learning units for different levels in each content area and would have different learning modes to suit the style of different learners.

A student entering such a system would have to select the learning units appropriate to him. This would mean, first of all, a clarification of his educational goals. Since these depend on life goals, the latter would have to be explored. Assessment of his already-developed behavior would assist him in

locating starting points. Since our system is collaborative, this assessment must mesh with the person's self-assessment. Throughout, an information support system is essential so that modes of learning, content areas, and starting points are intelligible.

Once into the system, the student may encounter problems in attaining the proximate objectives of a unit or the more distant goals he has set for himself. These can be called performance problems, and student personnel workers (process specialists) should be at hand to assist both the content specialist and the student discover the problem and set a course of action to overcome it.

As the student moves through this learning maze, he learns more about himself and his world. At various points, he needs to reconsider his goals and plans. This reconsideration should be encouraged and process specialists be available for consultation with him. Goals and plans should be reaffirmed or modified in accordance with the wishes of the student. As the student leaves this learning paradigm, it is important that some later contact be made to provide the feedback necessary for improvement of the system.

Nearly all of these essential steps in the system should be taken by process specialists (student personnel workers) in conjunction with content specialists (teachers). The system cannot function without these essentials. The tasks can be left to chance or to persons relatively untrained to perform them, but, if so, the real promise of the system proposed by so many will not be realized for the very students for whom it is proposed.

Educational Planning: An Example

The precepts that apply to educational planning are:

1. we can teach the planning process
2. at least 95% of the people can learn it
3. each person is expected to do his own planning
4. the plan should be changed as the person develops.

The process should advance in the following manner. Initially, the student should be assisted in exploring his own goals in life. This part of the process should continue until the student can at least sketch out some general directions for his life. Consideration of values and interests is important. The direction should be clear enough that some initial steps in that direction can be made; if not, a plan for exploration and desired outcomes should be defined.

Next, the student's present level of development should be assessed in relation to his general goals in life. What are his levels of competence in those intellectual areas necessary to meet his goals? If there are educational requirements to be met, what is his present competence in those areas? If psychomotor competencies are important, where does he stand now? His general life style may be important, for he may want to develop competencies in what are

presently called life-time sports. Interpersonal competencies are also to be considered, as they relate to his life goals. In any case, the assessment can include verbal interaction such as group-sharing, paper-and-pencil tests, other performance tests, self-evaluation, or a diagnostic counseling interview. This assessment can also be made in stages with the first stage aimed at getting an immediate start, and with follow-up sessions to continue the initial assessment.

The third step in the process relates to information. This is a twofold program. First, it provides necessary information about the college, programs, and classes. Second, it informs the student of the process he should use in relating goals, assessing information, and arriving at a tentative plan for his education.

At this point, progress is reviewed. If it is lacking, difficulties are diagnosed and a plan to overcome the lack is developed and followed. As progress is made, goals are reconsidered and plans affirmed or modified.

Other Applications

Orientation, or a pre-college planning session, can be part of the educational planning process described earlier. It can also help incoming students prepare for the kind of environment they are about to enter.

Within the human-development concept is a growing human-development curriculum--courses, for credit, taught by knowledgeable human-development process specialists (counselors), which address themselves directly to identity, value clarification, freeing interpersonal relations, and autonomy. Human Potential Seminars, Human Relations, Group Dynamics, Achievement Motivation Seminars, Leadership Training Seminars, and Encounter Groups are examples of these courses, and become important and valuable learning experiences to those who participate. Their focus on growth rather than on remediation, provision of regular and frequent contact with a counselor, use of a powerful group-process, and experiential learning make them a special vehicle for a human-development program. However, integration of some of the concepts into all our courses and programs would be far superior to a few courses in isolation.

In the area of staff development, a good human-development facilitator can help staff develop skills in good communication, helping, human relations, and team-building. These should have a place in a total human-development program. Staff members are human, too.

The applications mentioned above are only a few examples of how a human-development program can work. There are many others.

Summary

I have tried to explain briefly what a human-development program means and on what assumptions it is founded. Its advantages over previous models have been explored, and its compatibility with the new movement in instruction (employing a systems approach and based on mastery learning) has also been approached by comparing the hypotheses in each. Finally, I have tried to give examples of just how such a system would work in selected areas of a student personnel program.

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

William Waechter
H. Sanford Williams
Richard L. Jones

By legislative mandate, the professional performance of certificated staff members in all California community colleges is biennially evaluated according to plans developed within each institution.

Legal Ramifications of the Rodda Bill (SB696, 1971)

During the legislative session of 1971, the Senate and House adopted Senate Bill 696, which was signed by Governor Reagan and became effective on September 1, 1972. The Rodda Bill was a compromise that provided for the evaluation of all community college instructors and prescribed the means for judging and penalizing certificated personnel in the state's community colleges.

There is no question that the Rodda Bill is basically a punitive measure, designed to pacify those who would like to abolish tenure. We at Long Beach City College have worked vigorously to downgrade the punitive aspects of the bill and to emphasize those sections on evaluation that relate to improvement of instruction.

The bill did several things relating to tenure:

1. All contract employees (formerly known as probationary teachers) must must be evaluated every year.

2. All regular employees (formerly tenured teachers) must be evaluated at least every other year.

3. All evaluations must be conducted under the provisions of a district-approved evaluation plan.

4. First-year contract teachers can be released for cause with no right of appeal.

5. All employees whose services are found to be less than satisfactory can be penalized in a number of ways short of dismissal. A few of the penalties that may be imposed are:

    a. suspension for up to one year

    b. reduction or withholding of pay

    c. assignment of additional duties.

The bill also identifies a new type of employee, now referred to as a temporary employee, who has in the past been known as a substitute or short-term employee.

The bill also mandates that any temporary employee (with some minor exceptions) who works more than 75% of the school days or more than is normally considered 60% of a full teaching load shall be deemed a contract employee (probationary) finishing his first contract year.

As for action taken against a second-year contract or regular employee, the same rights of appeal apply as have always applied in California.

The other significant change concerning tenure is that a contract employee becomes a regular employee after having served two consecutive years rather than three.

Long Beach City College's Plan for Evaluation

Assumptions

Since a series of guidelines for the evaluation of the professional performance of certificated staff members was drawn up within this institution by representatives of the Academic Senate and the College Administration, certain assumptions were made and ultimately agreed to by the Board of Education:

1. Evaluation procedures are based on the premise that the faculty of Long Beach City College are professional, competent people. The primary purpose of evaluation criteria and procedures, shall therefore be to improve the instructional program. The effect of this assumption has been that the emphasis of evaluation procedures can be placed on the improvement of self-image, on the improvement of inter-staff relationships, and on increasingly effective communication among professional staff members and between instructors and students. Although the punitive intent of legislation that led to an evaluation system is obvious, with mutual good will among administrators and instructors, it has still been possible to build an effective program--partly as a result of its positive emphasis.

2. The basic role of the evaluation committee is to establish guidelines that will insure that the criteria and procedures of evaluation are uniform within the college, yet broad enough to allow for departmental differences in their application. To insure uniformity throughout the college, the following general criteria have been adopted and apply to the evaluation of each member of the teaching staff:

    a. knowledge of subject matter and/or special field of service

    b. professional growth

    c. methods of instruction and/or performance of duties

    d. acceptance of responsibility

e. effectiveness of communication

f. effectiveness of instruction and/or performance of duties

g. professional conduct.

Each department within the college worked as a unit to interpret these criteria. Most arrived at behaviorally-stated interpretations that can be used effectively as evaluation teams gather data concerning professional performance.

3. Evaluation of certificated personnel should occur, as much as possible, at normal points of contact between the individual to be evaluated and his evaluators; that is, artificial situations as bases for evaluation should be avoided.

4. Criteria and procedures for evaluation are considered to be only the first steps in a program that must allow for growth and development. The adoption of this idea assured that the evaluation program would be developmental in nature and could be changed from time to time as improvements were agreed on by the members of the staff.

Procedures for Evaluation

Contract faculty members (those who have achieved permanent status) shall be evaluated every year, and regular faculty members every other year. Because of the wide variety of activities within the college, consultation on how the instructional program may be improved has taken various forms. Recognizing this, each department has submitted its own procedures, i.e., the activities that will take place before the evaluation team meets. The team will meet with the teacher to be evaluated to discuss the objectives submitted by each of its members. The primary purpose of this meeting is to improve instruction, although most of the important work in this area will have been done before the meeting occurs. The team will file its recommendation on or before January 15.

The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team appointed by the president normally has the following members:

1. the teacher to be evaluated

2. an administrator appointed by the president

3. the teacher's immediate supervisor

4. at least one peer acceptable to the teacher

5. a certificated employee from his department or specialty, selected by his department or service unit.

Items to Be Submitted to the Evaluation Team

1. a statement by the teacher of his goals, methods, and philosophy
2. immediate supervisor's evaluation statement
3. peer evaluation statement
4. administrative evaluation statement
5. student evaluation.

Final Team Evaluation Form

When the evaluation team has its final meeting, the members jointly complete and sign the evaluation form if all members agree. The form becomes part of the teacher's permanent record. If agreement is not unanimous, the matter is referred to a retention team without recommendation. All of the items used by the team in filling out the evaluation form shall be given to the teacher if he is recommended for retention. If he is not recommended for retention, he shall be given copies of all material forwarded to the retention team.

Retention Team

If the evaluation committee agrees (according to the Board of Education and Academic Senate general guidelines and the standards established by the department) that the teacher's performance is unsatisfactory, the committee then files an evaluation report with the president, indicating specific problems and reservations, and requesting the establishment of a retention team. All file material gathered by the evaluation committee is given to the retention team.

The appropriate Vice President for those under his responsibility acts as chairman of the retention team; the remainder of the team is appointed by the president.

The retention team determines whether the evaluation team has made its recommendation on the basis of sufficient data and whether it has made efforts to improve the teacher's performance. The retention team takes the following steps:

1. It collects such further data as pertain to the total performance of the teacher's duties.
2. Following this collection of data, the chairman of the retention team calls the team together to consider the case and to formulate a recommendation, which he signs and forwards to the president.

3. The retention team presents its findings and recommendation to the one whose performance has been evaluated; he has the opportunity to initiate a written reaction to the findings and the recommendation. If he chooses to make a written reaction, his response becomes a permanent part of his personnel file. He may waive this opportunity to react, but he must do so also in writing.

4. The president of the college must receive the recommendation of the retention committee and the written reaction of the teacher by March 1.

Reactions to the First Year of Operation

Senate Bill 696 was viewed as punitive legislation by a large segment of the faculty. In spite of extensive teacher participation in developing the evaluation plan, feelings of anxiety, fear, insecurity, and distrust were clearly evident at the time of its enactment. As the staff became more deeply involved in the actual process, however, much of the discomfort disappeared and was replaced by a recognition of the many benefits that might have not accrued or that might have taken longer to develop if evaluation had not been legislated. Among the positive results were that:

1. The entire staff developed a renewed interest in improving instruction.

2. Communication improved at and between all levels.

3. Confidence, trust, and understanding were renewed or developed.

4. An atmosphere of openness was created when the staff freely discussed teaching and the evaluation process.

5. The evaluation process itself began to be evaluated almost immediately, and many constructive suggestions were proposed, both formally and informally.

6. Problems were identified and their resolution became a "team" effort.

7. The administration gained a firsthand understanding of the scope of the college and a better perspective on the many approaches to teaching a wide variety of subjects.

8. Goals and objectives were formulated, evaluated, and, in some cases, modified to better suit the needs of the students; goal setting and achievement received concentrated attention.

9. Teachers learned new ways to teach and/or to solve learning problems.

10. In the case of evaluation of administrators, their roles, lines of authority, and responsibilities were clarified.

As anticipated, several problems also became evident:

1. All departments did not implement the plan with the same spirit, interpretation, purpose, or depth of study.

2. The demands on team-members' time were enormous. Some administrators served on as many as fifteen teams, and the process invariably took much more than the already generous amount of time allotted in anticipation of the task.

3. The student evaluation was made immediately after mid-term of the fall semester, an unfortunate and inappropriate time.

4. All the questions on the student evaluation survey instrument were not valid for all departments and disciplines.

5. Part-time teachers had only student evaluations, not the benefits of the team approach.

6. It was occasionally necessary to replace one or more members of a team, causing not only a break in continuity, but also, in some cases, philosophical differences.

7. It became immediately evident that a step was lacking before referral to a retention team. The process evolved to include a "restudy team" to be implemented in 1973-74.

Long Beach City College grew and matured through its first year of operation under its evaluation plan. Its staff is active, is involved, and has a renewed awareness of sensitivity to its reason for existence. Its maiden flight was successful; the next one will be better, and so will the next. The punitive aspects of SB696 have been minimized, the benefits of instructional improvement are being maximized, and even more productive experiences in the future are anticipated.

RECOMMENDED EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR MCCCD

Ray A. Cattani

A. Philosophy of Evaluation

The overall purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of instruction at the institution.

The basic recommendation of the MCCCD Professional Growth Committee evaluation procedure grew out of the following two quotations:

> . . . whatever the variations in local options, . . . some key decisions . . . must be made in developing a successful program of teacher evaluation. It has become evident that the chief sources of disillusionment with programs for teacher evaluation arise from the failure to develop sufficiently detailed plans that spell out key decisions and anticipate realistic difficulties and possible controversies.[1]

> . . . the evaluation and termination process should apply to all faculty from the date of initial employment; . . . the tenure/probation system too often means that faculty on probation are dismissed for the wrong reasons or for no reason at all, while those on tenure cannot be dismissed even for the right reasons; . . . there is no real distinction between dismissal and non-renewal of contract . . . evaluation cannot be separated from the possibility of dismissal (non-renewal) unless we [admit] that dismissal of faculty is necessarily an arbitrary and capricious process . . . the criteria and methods of evaluation should be particularized; . . . they should be suited to the particular instructor's objectives with a particular group of students in a particular course; . . . abstract criteria, divorced from the classroom situation, are impossible to devise and apply and . . . attempts to do so . . . have been one of the major reasons for the failure of current systems of evaluation . . . . If evaluation is to become an instrument for the improvement of instruction, it cannot also be used to threaten and punish faculty members; . . . the current system--or lack of any real system--of evaluation must be replaced by one that will inspire the confidence rather than the fear of faculty members; . . . to do so, the evaluation/termination process must include . . . procedures [to] protect the civil, professional, and human rights of faculty members from arbitrary and capricious violation.[2]

---

[1] Milton Hildebrand, et al., Evaluating University Teaching. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1971.

[2] Faculty Evaluation and Termination Procedures, National Faculty Association, 1970.

In summary, we have attempted to

1. give the evaluated teacher as many options as possible
2. develop sufficiently detailed plans to spell out key decisions that can be understood ahead of time
3. apply the process to all faculty and other personnel
4. avoid the hypocrisy of trying to separate the evaluation procedure from the possibility of dismissal
5. prepare job descriptions and a code of ethics.

B. Certificated Staff Being Evaluated

1. Provisional Faculty--with three years of less at institution
2. Continuing Faculty--with more than three years at institution
3. Visiting Staff--not under contract teaching 1 - 9 hrs/semester
4. Department Chairman as teacher
5. Department Chairman as chairman
6. Administration
7. Support Services
   a. Counselors
   b. Librarians
   c. A/V Service People

C. Evaluating Agents

1. Peer group team
2. Administrative team
3. Self

D. Instruments Available to Evaluating Agents

1. Classroom observation

   In an initial conference, the teacher and his evaluating agent will work out the details for classroom observation (a required step). Beforehand, they mutually agree on the procedure.

2. Student questionnaire

   An approved form has been adopted. Regulations concerning its use are as follows:

   a. The faculty member involved shall be out of the classroom when the questionnaire is administered.

   b. Arrangements for administering the test shall be handled through department chairmen.

   c. The results for provisional teachers shall be considered a permanent part of the evaluation file, if this is one of his basic options.

   d. If this is part of the basic option for provisional faculty, all classes shall be evaluated.

   e. Questionnaires shall not be given all at once but between the 6th and 12th week of a semester.

   Results are privileged, but may be released if the teacher chooses.

3. Videotape

   Videotape for the provisional instructor may be rejected as an option if he sees the tape and chooses not to accept it. If so, another option must be chosen. If he chooses to use it, however, the committee (peer group or administrative team) may see it. The tape is regarded as privileged. There must be at least two tapes of complete class periods for provisional instructors to satisfy this option.

4. Objectives and outcomes

5. Outside activity checklist (not an option for classroom evaluation)

   a. District committees

   b. Campus committees

   c. Professional organizations--offices held

   d. Travel

   e. Course work

   f. Workshops

   g. Office hours

   h. Record keeping

i. Publications

j. Special projects

k. Self-evaluation: Yes___ No___

l. Instruments used

E. Provisional Faculty

Provisional faculty shall undergo a classroom visitation evaluation each of their first three years. The number of visitations, which may include one or more members of the evaluation team, shall depend on preconsultation between the team and the faculty member. At the discretion of the faculty member, the evaluation may be either an administrative team or a peer group. The provisional instructor will also be required to choose one of the remaining three instruments for evaluation during each year.

The following policy governs evaluation by a peer group (as opposed to an administrative team):

1. Evaluation

   a. A separate evaluation team shall be established for each faculty member. Each team shall consist of one member of the faculty elected by the appropriate Department/Division, one member of the campus faculty chosen by the faculty member being evaluated (his choice could include a dean or a faculty member outside his Department/Division), and the appropriate chairman.

   b. In an initial conference, the teacher and his committee are required to work out the details for classroom observation. The teacher shall also select another evaluation instrument.

   c. The participants shall implement the evaluation according to the criteria and methods agreed on.

   d. The results of the evaluation shall be reviewed by all participants.

   e. A written report signed by all team members and the faculty member shall be placed in his evaluation file, with a copy to him. It shall include the method of evaluation, criteria established by the evaluation team, an outline of strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement.

   f. An evaluated faculty member may answer the report in writing, his answer to be filed with the original report.

   g. A successful evaluation will be reported to the Dean of Instruction.

h. If the consensus of the team is that the faculty member is seriously deficient in some area(s), he shall be so notified in writing. The Dean of Instruction will also be so notified and the full report submitted to him. The team, the faculty member, and the Dean of Instruction shall then agree on steps to improve any area(s). The evaluation team assumes the responsibility for helping him improve his instructional techniques.

i. If a faculty member has received a letter of inadequacy, the evaluation shall be repeated during the next half-year.

j. If the report is unfavorable, the teacher will be given the next academic year to correct his deficiencies under the direction of his original team.

k. If a faculty member who has received a letter of inadequacy is still performing his duties unsatisfactorily at the end of the second evaluation period, the team shall report to the Dean of Instruction and to the faculty member, specifying the deficiencies that caused the unfavorable evaluation.

l. The Dean of Instruction shall visit the teacher after receiving the letter of inadequacy and take whatever steps he deems necessary.

The following policy shall govern evaluation by an administrative team (as opposed to a peer group).

The procedures for the administrative evaluation team are the same as for the peer group outlined above, except that Section a is changed to read:

a. A separate evaluation team shall be established for each faculty member. Each team consists of the Dean of Instruction and the Department/Division Chairman, but the instructor may choose any other operational dean or the Executive Dean as a substitute for the Dean of Instruction. (The portions b through k under peer group on notifying the Dean of Instruction, when he is not a member of the group team, are also inoperative under administrative evaluation.)

F. Termination Procedure

When the Dean of Instruction receives an unfavorable report from either team, he must act within 30 days. If he recommends removal, the teacher may appeal to the PR&R committee for a final recommendation, which will be made to the Executive Dean.

If the Dean of Instruction and/or the Executive Dean do not agree with the recommendations of the team, they will detail their reasons in writing.

All evaluative files for provisional faculty (separate from the teacher's regular personnel file) will be kept in the office of the Dean of Instruction. They will be available to the teacher, the Department/Division Chairman, administrators, and, when in session, the evaluation team. The files will be sealed. Only the evaluation committee, the Dean of Instruction, and the teacher may put material in the files.

G. Continuing Faculty

The use of administrative team, peer group, and self-evaluation is as described under Provisional Faculty.

Continuing faculty undergo a classroom visitation evaluation every sixth year, by either an administrative team or a peer group. The faculty member also chooses at least one of the three other evaluative instruments. In each of the intervening five years, continuing faculty choose at least one of the evaluating instruments under Self (as outlined under Provisional Faculty). They certify that this has been done and place the certificate (plus their comments) in their evaluation file, which is available to the observation team (administrative or peer) in the sixth year. Continuing faculty may avail themselves of other evaluative procedures at any time.

1. Questionnaire

Procedures are as outlined under Provisional Faculty except:

a. As part of his own self-evaluation during the five years between other evaluations, the continuing teacher has the option of making this result part of his file.

b. If this is part of the basic option for a continuing teacher during his sixth year, all classes will be evaulated, and it will be a part of the permanent evaluation file.

2. Videotape

Procedures are as outlined for Provisional Faculty except:

a. If the continuing teacher chooses this for self-evaluation, he may dispose of the tape as he chooses.

b. If the continuing teacher chooses video during his sixth year, the report of the review committee becomes a part of the record. The tape may be kept as part of the record at the option of the teacher or the team. The teacher may reject the tape as an option after he has seen it and choose another option. He must have a minimum of two tapes.

3. Disposition of Material

Self-evaluative material accumulated over the five-year period need not, but may, be included in evaluative files (except for the self-evaluation form). The sixth-year file is kept in the office of the Dean of Instruction, to be opened only in the presence of the teacher, and then accessible only to the instructor, the Department/Division, administrators, and, when in session, the evaluation team. The file will be sealed and available to the team during the time of evaluation. Only the instructor and the evaluating team may put in material.

H. Visiting Staff

The Dean or Director with assigned supervision over visiting staff and the Department Chairman or his appointee will comprise the evaluation team. Two instruments, classroom visitation and a student questionnaire, are used. Evaluation is done on a semester basis.

The visiting staff member will employ the student questionnaire. It will be administered by the Department/Division Chairman and results given to the faculty member, the Department/Division Chairman, and the appropriate Dean. The questionnaire will be used on a semester basis between the sixth and twelfth weeks. All files will be maintained in the office assigned to the administration of visiting staff.

I. Department Chairman as Teacher

The chairman may be either a provisional or a continuing instructor (see Sections E and G). He may choose to be evaluated by either the peer group or the administrative team. If he chooses the latter, he shall select a member from within the department/division to replace himself on the team. If he chooses the peer group, he will select not one but two members of the team. Both must be from his own department. If a department has fewer than four members, the Dean of Instruction will appoint the evaluating team in consultation with the department/division.

J. Department Chairman as Chairman

Evaluation shall be on an annual basis, the method changing in each of three successive years and then repeating itself.

Year 1: The Evaluation team shall be made up of the Dean of Instruction and another Department/Division Chairman to be mutually agreed upon and one person from a Faculty Senate or Association appointment outside the department.

Year 2: Evaluation will be done by the Dean of Instruction.

Year 3: Self-evaluation will be the same as self-evaluation for administrators (see Section K).

K. Administrators

Campus administrators shall establish an annual evaluation procedure that shall differ for each of three years and then repeat itself.

Year 1: This shall be an in-house evaluation involving only procedures now in effect or as refined. An evaluation team shall consist of the Executive Dean and one person of the administrator's choice.

Year 2: An evaluation team shall be established to consist of the Executive Dean, one person chosen by the administrator, and one faculty member appointed by the Faculty Association or Senate. (In the evaluation of the Executive Dean, the District President shall take the Executive Dean's place on the evaluation team. The rest of the team remains the same.)

Year 3: Self-evaluation instruments shall be objectives-outcome forms, a check-sheet, and a questionnaire to be distributed to the faculty.

Evaluative files will be accessible to the members of the team during the period of evaluation.

L. Support Services

The Workshop on Evaluation has met with representatives from counseling, library, and A/V services. Members are being asked to form subcommittees to consider means and instruments for their evaluative procedures, and have received suggestions for a faculty questionnaire and a check-sheet similar to the one for class-room visitation.

The subcommittees are being asked to consider the possibilities of writing job descriptions and questionnaires.

OFFICE OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AT GROSSMONT COLLEGE

Erv F. Metzgar

This paper describes the program of the Office of Affirmative Action at Grossmont College designed to achieve a balanced representation of minority groups and women at all levels of faculty and staff.

The underlying premise of the Grossmont College Affirmative Action Program is that, for many years, both intentionally and unintentionally, institutions within our society have followed practices that have systematically discriminated against individuals and groups on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, or sex. As an educational institution, the college has an obligation to help change attitudes that perpetuate discrimination and exclude minorities and women from certain occupations. Each of us must meet this obligation fully and fairly. Moreover, everyone involved in the recruitment, selection, training, supervision, evaluation, or remuneration of faculty and staff has a responsibility to ensure equal opportunities for all employees, current and prospective.

Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action: Executive Order 11246

Executive Order 11246, as amended, embodies two concepts: nondiscrimination and affirmative action.

Nondiscrimination requires the elimination of all prohibited discriminatory conditions, whether intentional or inadvertent. The college must systematically examine all its employment policies and procedures to be sure that they they do not operate to the detriment of any person on grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The college must also ensure that the practices of all supervisors are nondiscriminatory.

Affirmative Action requires the college to do more than ensure employment neutrality on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. As the phrase implies, it also requires the college to try to recruit, employ, and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded, even when such exclusion cannot be traced to particular discriminatory actions by the institution. The premise of Executive Order 11246 is that, unless positive action is undertaken to overcome the effects of systematic institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination, a benign neutrality in employment practices will tend to perpetuate the status quo ante.

Who is Protected by Executive Order 11246?

Nondiscrimination requires the Executive Order to apply to all persons, whether or not they are members of designated "minority groups."

Affirmative Action expressly forbids any preference based on race or sex. The institution is required to make a "genuine, good faith effort" and document its activities to seek out qualified minorities and women. Its criteria must be objective and job-related, and apply equally to all candidates.

These federal requirements were designed to enhance employment opportunities for minorities and women. Minorities are defined by the federal government as Negroes, Spanish-surnamed, American Indians, and Orientals.

Nothing in the Executive Order requires that the college eliminate or dilute standards necessary for the successful performance of the institution's educational functions. The Affirmative Action concept does not require that the college employ or promote the unqualified. It does require that any standards or criteria that have had the effect of excluding minorities and women be eliminated, unless it can be demonstrated that they are necessary for successful performance.

Nothing in the Executive Order requires or permits the college to dismiss, demote, or displace persons on grounds of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. To do so would violate the Executive Order. Affirmative Action goals are to be sought through filling vacancies created by normal growth and attrition in existing positions.

Personnel Policies and Practices

The college must establish in reasonable detail and make available on request, the standards and procedures that govern all employment practices in the operation of each organizational unit, including any tests in use and the criteria for appointment, retention, or promotion. It should be demonstrated that such standards and criteria are valid predictors of job performance, relevant to the duties of the particular position in question. This requirement should not ignore the range of permissible discretion that has characterized employment judgments, particularly in the certificated staff area. Where such discretion appears to have operated to deny equality of opportunity, it must be rigorously examined and its discriminatory effects eliminated. There are real and proper limits on the extent to which criteria for certificated employment can be explicitly articulated, but the absence of any articulation of criteria provides possibilities for arbitrary and discriminatory employment decisions.

Where employment policies have the effect of excluding qualified minorities or women, and where their effects cannot be mitigated by the implementation of additional policies, they must be eliminated.

Recruitment

Recruitment is the way an institution develops an applicant pool from which to select individuals for employment. It may be an active process, communicating its employment needs through advertisement, word-of-mouth, notification to graduate schools, specialized employment centers, professional meetings, or job registers. It may also be a passive process of including in the applicant pool those who, on their own initiative or by unsolicited recommendation, show an interest in a particular position.

In both certificated and classified areas, colleges must recruit minority persons and women as actively as they have recruited non-minority men. Some colleges, for example, have tended to recruit heavily at institutions graduating exclusively or predominantly non-minority men, have failed to advertise in media

that reach minorities and women, or have relied on personal contacts and friendships that have excluded women and minority groups from consideration.

The informality of word-of-mouth recruiting and its reliance on factors outside the control of the college make it particularly susceptible to abuse. In addition, since minorities and women are often not in word-of-mouth channels of recruitment, their candidacies may not be advanced with the frequency they merit.

College officials must periodically examine the recruitment activities and policies of the college. Where the examination reveals a significantly lower representation of minorities or women in the applicant pool than would be likely from their availability in the work force, the college must modify its recruiting practices vigorously and systematically to encourage the candidacy of qualified minorities and women.

Hiring

The personnel department, as the college service organization for employment, necessarily plays a key role in the Affirmative Action program. Its employees ensure that college policies and procedures are scrupulously followed. In addition, personnel provides expert assistance in recruitment, job definition, and salary assignment.

Once an applicant pool has been established through recruitment, selection from it must follow procedures designed to ensure nondiscrimination. In all cases, standards and criteria for employment should be made reasonably explicit and should be accessible to all employees and applicants. Such standards must not make distinctions based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, or be applied inconsistently to deny equality of opportunity.

Recruitment and hiring decisions governed by unverified assumptions about a particular individual's willingness or ability to relocate, because of his or her race or sex, are in violation of Executive Order 11246. For example, college employers should not assume that a woman will be unwilling to accept an offer because of her marital status, or that a minority person will be unwilling to live in a predominantly white community.

A nondiscriminatory selection process does not mean that a department should indulge in "reverse discrimination" or "preferential treatment," selecting unqualified persons over qualified or qualifiable ones.

Conditions of Work

The college must ensure nondiscrimination in all terms and conditions of employment, including work assignments, educational and training opportunities, use of facilities, and opportunities for advancement. (Reference: Section 800.129 of Interpretative Bulletin Title 29, Part 800 of the Code of Federal Regulations—Equal Pay for Equal Work Under the Fair Labor Standards Act.)

The jobs to which the Equal Pay Standard applies are the ones that require equal responsibility. Responsibility is the degree of accountability required

in the performance of the job, with emphasis on the importance of job obligation. Differences in the degree of responsibility required in the performance of otherwise equal jobs cover a wide variety of situations. (Reference: Section 800.140, Interpretative Bulletin, Title 29, etc.)

Generally, employees performing jobs requiring equal skill, effort, and responsibility are likely to be working under similar conditions. On the other hand, slight or inconsequential differences in essentially similar working conditions would not justify a differential in pay. Such differences are not usually considered by employers in setting wages.

Intentional policy or practice that subjects a particular sex or minority to a heavier work load, teaching load, or a less desirable assignment violates the Executive Order.

Promotion

Periodic reviews of the qualifications of all employees should be made to ensure that all employees, especially minority persons and women, are given full opportunity for promotion and that their skills are fully utilized.

Recruitment practices shall be reviewed each year so that minorities and women in the potential employment area are notified of job opportunities and encouraged to apply.

The personnel department will make known within the college those openings that could possibly provide promotion for current staff members. It should also maintain records of those who have taken the initiative and expressed an interest in promotion or transfer. Moreover, it should encourage all qualified and qualifiable employees to seek opportunities for advancement within the institution.

Responsibility for Implementation

Ultimate responsibility for the Affirmative Action Program lies with the President of Grossmont College. Subordinate to him are the Affirmative Action Officer, Personnel Manager, Affirmative Action Committee, and Advisory Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Their responsibilities should include, but not necessarily be limited to:

a. establishing procedures to overcome the under-use of minority and female employees

b. developing a strategy for locating minority and women applicants in each department

c. reviewing hiring criteria to make certain the requirements are really necessary for job performance (Are certain degrees really required? Are requisite skills really used?)

d. reviewing hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion criteria to ensure that neither qualified nor qualifiable candidates are excluded from consideration

e. devising ways to help increase the available pool of candidates

f. conducting annual reviews of progress and, if necessary, recommending re-evaluation and corrective action

g. working with vice presidents, deans, and department chairmen to ensure achievement of goals for both certificated and classified staff

h. developing and implementing an in-service program in human relations for the entire college community

i. attending all meetings of the Affirmative Action Committee and the Advisory Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity

j. implementing, with the assistance of the college personnel manager, the Affirmative Action Program for the classified staff.

Affirmative Action Committee: Whenever necessary, but at least once a year, it will consult with the president on recommendations for the internal operation of the Affirmative Action Program. This committee shall consist of the Assistant Superintendent, two Vice Presidents, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Technical-Vocational Education, the Dean of Guidance Services, seven faculty members, the Affirmative Action Coordinator, and the college Personnel Manager.

Advisory Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity: At least once a year this committee shall meet with the president to review annual progress concerning equal employment opportunity at the college and to make suggestions for the subsequent year. The committee shall consist of two students, two faculty members, two administrators, two classified staff members, two community members, and the Affirmative Action Coordinator.

Services

The Office of Affirmative Action is open to all members of the college community. Its vital function is to listen to and investigate any complaints, grievances, or inquiries pertaining to discrimination. Complaints should be made without fear of reprisal.

Because Affirmative Action is the legal and moral responsibility of each of us, we must be increasingly creative as we (1) become totally familiar with the policies and procedures as adopted by the Governing Board, (2) examine where we are in terms of staff and student body makeup, equal opportunity in employment, and education, and (3) make our needs and commitments known to the community, so that its members may not only look to us for leadership, but also join us in creating a richer life experience.

Acknowledgements

Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 11246, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary, Office for Civil Rights.

A Guide for Affirmative Action, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Your Rights Under Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action, University of Utah.

Affirmative Action Program for Grossmont College, Grossmont Community College District.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES PROGRAMS

Ervin L. Harlacher

Whenever I am asked to speak on community services, I am reminded of the time a group of temperance ladies visited Sir Winston Churchill to protest his devotion to alcohol. "Why Mr. Churchill," one lady said, "if all the brandy you've drunk were poured into this room, it would fill up to here." She held her hand half way up the wall. Churchill shook his head. "So little accomplished, so much to do," he said sadly. Indeed, if all the words I have said or written about community services were poured into this room, I would be standing at least knee-deep in them. And still there is so much to do!

Although most community colleges today claim community service as one of their major functions, too few are actively engaged in developing it to its fullest potential. Yet that very potential--its unusual services to the community--is what makes an institution a community college.

I shall attempt to define some of the relevant terms used in the community service/continuing education fields. I shall also present a brief case study of the program of community services at Brookdale, and shall conclude with a recommendation for developing ever more effective ones.

Definitions

Some hesitancy about building dynamic programs of community service probably stems from an insufficient understanding of what it is. This lack of understanding results from at least two misconceptions: (1) that community services and adult or continuing education are synonymous; and (2) that they constitute a program of educational public relations. Although all three are interrelated, each more properly should be considered on its own merits, with careful definition of the terms.

In its broadest sense, adult education has been defined as "the kind of education that will increase and improve citizen participation in decision-making, that will lead to the enrichment of community living, that will release the full power of a society rooted in respect for human dignity and the sanctity of human personality."[1] Perhaps this concept has led some to believe that the community service function actually emerged from adult education. This may be accounted for by the fact that most community colleges, recognizing the need for adult education, provide evening programs for those who, for various reasons, cannot become regular full-time day students. But these programs are little more than formalized evening classes for adults, some of them offered any time ten or more citizens want them, provided teacher, space, funds, and equipment are available. In its formalized sense, adult education may be classified as one--but not the only--kind of community service.

---

1 Paul Sheats, Clarence D. Jayne, and Ralph B. Spence. Adult Education. New York: Dryden Press, 1953.

Nor has the recent substitution of continuing education for adult education contributed to clearing up the confusion surrounding the terms. As a matter of fact, continuing education could describe the entire formal education program of the community college, for adults are found in all phases of it, day and evening, weekend and summer. Some take preparatory courses for transfer to senior colleges and universities; others take occupational courses to improve themselves in their work or obtain the associate in applied science degree; still others take courses to broaden their educational and cultural experiences or help them use leisure time more effectively. Programs of community services are not limited to adults of the community; they are provided for people of all ages, occupations, and levels of educational development, including high school students, elementary students, and even preschool children. They encompass both formal and informal educational experiences.

As for community services being merely a public relations vehicle, this point of view is not only mistaken but fraught with danger. A truly effective community service program is unlimited in either function or scope, while public relations concerns more the perpetuation of the organization than providing educational services for the community. There is, of course, an important relationship between community services and the college's over-all public relations. Unquestionably, a comprehensive program of community services, developed in response to community needs and with community cooperation, will have a profound effect on the college's public image. In fact, whenever the community service program has been highly developed, the college has been able to so consolidate the interests of town and gown that it has met with few difficulties in securing community financial support.

An effective program of community services has four primary objectives:

1. to become a center of community life by encouraging the use of college facilities and services by community groups when such use does not interfere with the college's regular schedule

2. to provide for all age groups educational services that use the special skills and knowledge of the college staff and other experts, and that are designed to satisfy the requirements of community groups and the college district at large

3. to provide the community, including business and industry, with the leadership and coordinating capabilities of the college, to assist the community in long-range planning, and to join with individuals and groups in attacking unsolved problems

4. to contribute to and promote the cultural, intellectual, and social life of the college district community and the development of skills for the profitable use of leisure time.

Community Services: A Case Study

How does a college go about developing the activities that will implement each of these objectives? First, we must assume that the Division of Community Services has equal stature with all other divisions of the college.

Terminology may vary from school to school, but the basic principle remains the same. If the college is organized by division, by school, by institute--whatever--then one of these should be called Community Services.

At my own college, for example, decentralized organization distributes related academic/occupational programs among four institutes, each of which represents one of the general career clusters: Applied Humanities, Business and Management, Human Affairs, and Natural and Applied Sciences. We also have a fifth institute--the Institute of Community Services, which is on an equal footing with the academic institutes and interacts with them in program development. All institutes are relatively autonomous and all have their individual deans. The five deans, along with the Executive Dean of Student and Educational Development and the Vice President for College Operations, served this past year on the President's Cabinet. Thus, Community Services has been an integral part of Brookdale's over-all educational enterprise, not the illegitimate child at the family picnic.

Having status in the organization is important, not only to the director of community services but to the administration, to the faculty, and to the community at large. Several years ago, when I was gathering material for my book on The Community Dimension of the Community College,[2] I repeatedly discovered that the community services administrator was regarded by faculty--and by some top administrators--as somewhat outside the Pale. In consequence, whenever the need for belt-tightening arose, community service programs were the first to be cut. Not that much money was saved by such action, but it provided a visible example of the administration's attempts at economizing.

Without status, offices of community services also had difficulty in enlisting the support of the regular faculty, who exhibited a singular reluctance to participate in noncredit programs, considering them to be subcollegiate. It is possible, of course, that such individuals were reflecting the general philosophy of their college administrations rather than their own biases, but in suggesting this possibility, I am being studiously charitable. The fact is that community services have so long been confused with the banal offerings of high school adult education, that many college faculty think of such service in terms of basketweaving, ballroom dancing, candy making, and similar noncredit programs. Where status was lacking, the community at large took only desultory interest in offerings provided by community services, regarding them as "gimmicks" by which to garner a few extra dollars for the college from citizens with empty hours to fill.

Many colleges make the mistake of reducing community services to a kind of auxiliary activity for the director of extended-day programs--the formal side of learning that has little relationship to true community service. With attention thus divided, the administrator has little time to get out into the community and discover the wants of people for which programs do not already exist, to become acquainted with community leaders--the movers and the doers--to develop community advisory councils, to keep in touch with the career requirements of business, industry, community agencies, and professions. All

---

[2] Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

these are legitimate functions of the community service administrator. He ought to be allowed the time to perform them, and, as his operation grows, his staff should be allowed to expand commensurately.

At Brookdale, for example, the Executive Dean of Community Services is assisted by a Dean of Community Education and Development, a Dean of Community Cultural Affairs, a Director of College Extension Services who coordinates off-campus credit courses, a Director of Human Resources Programs who operates the Community Learning Center in Long Branch for the black community (including a day-care center for children of working mothers), and a coordinator of Special Services. The Executive Dean has over-all responsibility for administering the program of community services which, more and more, is reaching out into the community, both to identify community needs and desires and to satisfy them. (Last year, for example, this program had a total attendance of approximately 200,000 people.) Responsibility for developing each segment of the total program is delegated to the officers named. Let us examine for the moment what this responsibility entails.

With the help of numerous advisory councils, the Dean of Community Education and Development organizes short courses, workshops, seminars, institutes, and conferences in such community interests as pollution abatement; upgrading the skills of the working-class woman; nature study and the preservation of natural resources; training community residents as geriatric aides, mental health assistants, and cafeteria-playground aides for the public schools. Offered in response to widespread community demand, these activities have been heavily attended, though none carries credit. A summer series, titled "Sunglasses Seminars," covers such topics as home decoration, community beautification, safety in boat handling, and organic gardening. Though these programs are only representative of our offerings last year, it is significant that a total of 2,846 county residents, seeking further education only for the sake of expanding their intellectual horizons, attended our Institute of Community Services.

During the current year, 28 separate programs are being run. These range from "Pit Stop," a course for laymen in automotive repair taught in the college's automotive laboratory, to Lip Reading and Sign Language for the deaf, to Real Estate Principles and Practices, to an Institute of Interreligious Studies. Many of Brookdale's faculty participate in these programs, though series are shared with experts from all segments of the community.

In organizing such offerings, every effort is made to keep cost to a minimum so that as many people as possible can take advantage of them. When it is feasible to use campus facilities as learning sites, costs can usually be kept within the $10 to $15 range. All programs are self-sustaining; some even make a profit.

One of our most profitable offerings has been a series of seven short courses in Pupil Transportation, developed in cooperation with the New Jersey State Department of Education. Completion of the series, now in its second year, leads to a Transportation Supervisor's Certificate--without college credit, of course. So great has been the demand for this series, statewide, that it has been necessary to secure the cooperation of other county colleges

to make the courses available to residents in their communities. In most instances, cooperating colleges merely provide facilities in which the series can be given, allowing Brookdale to retain control of the program. In the one college that refused to participate on this basis, Brookdale willingly turned over its materials and gave the college carte blanche to conduct the courses.

Another successful program is the one at Sandy Hook State Park, which serves as a college extension center. Here, credit courses in Oceanography and Marine Biology are offered by the Institute of Natural and Applied Sciences. Here, too, the Institute of Community Services conducts noncredit courses that instruct elementary and secondary teachers throughout the county in methods of teaching environmental studies. For a nominal fee, paid by the respective school districts, these teachers receive training not otherwise available to them, unless they returned, at their own expense, to formal graduate study.

These various programs in community education and development will give you some idea of the broad spectrum of community needs and desires that community service programs can fulfill. The question naturally arises: How can such programs be financed?

The Brookdale formula, differing from other institutions' perhaps, is quite simple. Since our emphasis is on program content, we and the instructor agree on a flat fee for his services and add to this the cost of supplies plus 20 percent of the combined figures to cover overhead--mailing brochures, advertising, rental (if any), and the like. We divide this total by the minimum number of students required to make the program run, and set our fee at this figure. Some programs attract more students than we anticipate and, in such circumstances, make a small profit for the institute. Other programs will not run at all because of low enrollments, and the fees paid by initial registrants are refunded.

This formula has been adopted because the Institute of Community Services accounts for an infinitessimal percentage of the total college budget, making it mandatory that their programs be self-sustaining. Much of the burden for this mandate falls upon the Department of Community Education and Development, for the Department of Cultural Affairs certainly is no money-maker.

The Department of Cultural Affairs is no less an educational effort than Community Education and Development. Its task, however, is more difficult, for it responds less to community demand than to a discernible community need. New Jersey's proximity to New York City allows those who can afford it to travel the necessary 40 miles to attend concerts, operas, ballets, museums, art exhibits, theaters, and all other offerings called "cultural." This leaves a considerable group, those who cannot afford the cost involved in such junkets, in danger of cultural impoverishment. Therefore, strictly as a community service, the college sponsors arts festivals, concerts, film presentations, forums, art and photographic exhibits, ceramics displays, and similar activities. The fee--when one is charged--is nominal. The college also provides opportunity for cultural growth and development through a variety of experiences for effective use of leisure time and through community participation in the arts. Under the leadership of the Dean of Cultural Affairs, for example, community personnel--along

with students--have been organized into a Symphonic Band that last year played to nearly 29,000 persons. When you consider that the county's total population is nearly half a million, however, 29,000 doesn't seem a very large proportion to have been attracted. This illustrates the ever-present need to educate the public to the values inherent in cultural experiences.

We are striving to overcome a certain apathy on the part of some members of the public, but the main reason we keep making cultural opportunities available is that a relatively small, but viable, group of citizens faithfully attend our cultural events and genuinely appreciate them. Last summer, for instance, Community Services, in cooperation with the Institute of Applied Humanities, offered three theatrical workshops in which community personnel participated with students in writing, directing, producing, and acting in original plays. This extremely successful venture will be repreated in the future. A Christmas tour of the art centers of Europe for both students and community members was arranged last year through Community Services-Cultural Affairs, and a similar one for this year is planned. Exhibits by community artists drew approximately 37,000 viewers to the College's Learning Resources Center, a Sportsman's Fair attracted a record crowd, and a dozen or so community cultural organizations, such as The Monmouth Museum, make the Lincroft campus their home. The ripple effect of the pebble of cultural affairs dropped in the pool of the community in 1969, when the college first opened, has grown wider and wider each year.

Special Services in the Institute assume responsibility for arranging campus tours, for coordinating College Speakers Bureaus, for making campus facilities available to community groups and organizations as requested, and for coordinating the use of community facilities and personnel in the formal college program.

Taking college to the people is one part of Brookdale's philosophy that the whole of its host county is its campus. Consequently, the Community Services Institute operates, through its Extension Services Department, fifteen extension centers located throughout Monmouth County. Most of these are in area high schools. However, an elementary school, a junior high school, a church, and the College's Community Learning Center in a ghetto area are used. Most classes meet one night a week over a fifteen-week period and several centers operate during the daytime hours. Extension classes are in session Monday morning through Saturday morning. Ninety-two sections of 35 different courses are currently running at these centers.

In addition, the Extension Services Department operates the Weekend College, held on the main campus, and had approximately 400 course enrollments during the 1972 Fall Term. This project enables a student to meet all the requirements for an Associate in Arts Degree in Business Administration, Education, or Humanities through exclusive Saturday morning and/or Saturday afternoon attendance. This fall, Weekend College students are taking 18 different classes.

The Extension Services Department is also organized to run classes in area business, industrial, government, and welfare organizations. Currently two classes are in operation for the staff of the Monmouth Community Action Program

at its headquarters. Six classes are in operation this fall at Fort Monmouth for active-duty servicemen. Furthermore, the director of Extension Services, with Fort Monmouth educational officers, is in the process of developing curricular offerings that would meet the full requirements for an Associate in Arts Degree to be taught on the base. Fort Monmouth personnel, both active servicemen and civilians, would be provided released time for class work leading to a degree in business, business administration, education, or humanities. Fort Monmouth is the home of the Signal Corps and the site of many specialized training programs in electronics-related fields. Currently efforts are being directed toward establishing the procedures for providing science-equivalent college credit for successful completion of such programs, which then would apply toward a Brookdale degree.

Of particular interest are the activities in behalf of human resources development carried out by another segment of the Community Services Institute: namely, the Community Learning Center in Long Branch. Located in the heart of one of the county's largest black communities, the Center is probably a unique community service program, concentrating as it does on counseling, college preparatory programs, and college courses for community residents who have economic and educational deficiencies. It provides the nucleus around which Brookdale hopes to develop "The Community Renewal College." Rather, the Community Learning Center is one manifestation of the entire community service concept that actually gave birth to the Community Renewal College idea. There, educational services tailored to the needs of disadvantaged people are provided--if I may borrow from Samuel Gould's penetrating Knowledge Is Not Enough--" . . . in a friendly and informal fashion, without thought of credits or degrees or anything more than to assist the burgeoning of understanding in the individual as a member of a personal, physical, political, economic, artistic, and spiritual world." There in 1971-72, approximately 460 individuals, many of them high school dropouts, were served through the General Educational Development (for blacks and those with Spanish surnames) and English as a Second Language programs. In this same Learning Center an experimental program was undertaken in which maladjusted high school students could learn outside their familiar learning environments. So successful was this program with a limited number of students that, in the current year, despite some misgivings on the part of the county superintendent of schools, the program has been expanded to accept all referrals from high school principals, who thoroughly endorse the program.

Many of us educators are inclined to emphasize formal education leading to one degree or another, forgetting that informal education, which community services offer, has a vital role to play in the lives of most people. Someone once remarked that the stamp of an educated man is the ability to make a reasoned guess on the basis of insufficient information. Indeed, knowledge is such a perishable commodity these days that a college education at the end of a four-year span is already almost obsolete.

Not all people have the time and few have the necessary academic background to enter or return to college for additional formal education that will prevent their personal obsolescence. It is these people for whom the program of community services--with its short courses, its intensive workshops, its continuing seminars and conferences--holds out the light of hope. For, as personal obsolescence grows, a community tends to decline.

What I now envision for the community of Monmouth County--indeed, for every community in the land--is the Community Renewal College I mentioned earlier--one that would be a network of learning sites to make the entire county a laboratory for learning; one that would emphasize multi-media, multi-model, self-instructional learning systems, free-scheduled courses, and recognize that what is learned is more important than what is taught; one that would take advantage of its ever-recurring opportunities to participate in the continuous re-creation and restructuring of the society of which it is a part. A new social invention, at least in some of its aspects, it would be in fact--not just in name--a "people's college," unconfined by any campus, decentralized, and flourishing in every corner of its community. It would have as its mission helping individuals to grow and develop in a variety of ways; helping them to reach maximum employment; helping them to acquire the skills, attitudes, and knowledge to restore and improve their neighborhoods; helping them to reach the enlightened judgments so critical to our society; helping them, at last, to create a learning society.

The Community Renewal College would emphasize that society, like democracy, is not an heirloom to be handed down intact from generation to generation. Rather, because conditions of its environment are perennially in flux, society must be recreated by generation after generation, so that the costly disease of community decay and the wasteful erosion of human resources can be prevented.

Becoming a Community Renewal College will require change. First, we must learn to read of the day's community events and what is happening to us, not them. Crime in our streets, not their streets; our politicians, not their politicians; our businessmen, not their businessmen; and our policemen, not their policemen. The problems of the community should be seen as the shared problems of the campus. We must seek opportunities to make a contribution to the life off-campus, and to match our resources to off-campus needs just as vigorously as to campus problems. No longer may we safely enjoy the luxury of a detached concern for the world outside. The poverty, the crime, the corruption, the pollution, the problems of the ill and aging are our problems, too; and, there is not one of us who is not rich in resources that could be brought to bear. We have skilled manpower, expertise, facilities (from athletic fields to theatres), art rooms, laboratories, lecture halls and basketball courts. When our community's students aren't in them, our senior citizens, our youth, and our housewives should be.

We must also reorder many of our priorities and rethink many of our assumptions regarding "college" itself. Talk of the sidewalk college, or "street academies," the open university, and the external degree are moving us in that direction, but we must go well beyond our present thinking to create Community Renewal Colleges--colleges that are committed to renewal in all its forms: human renewal for all of our people; urban renewal of our cities and neighborhoods; environmental renewal of the greater communities we serve; political renewal that is so critical in a republic based on the premise of "the people shall judge;" and even perhaps the moral and spiritual renewal of a great nation.

The ultimate mission of the Community Renewal College is to make the college and community synonymous--a completely integrated whole. Community service programs have already served to move the college toward this goal by attracting

community personnel in both advisory and instructional capacities, but the interaction--the developing whole--between college and community goes farther than the interchange of college and community personnel. As students move out from the central campus to use community resources for learning experiences, they find an opportunity for community service both they and the college were unaware of: tutoring fellow-students and those at the elementary and secondary levels, poll-taking for political organizations, surveys for new and developing industries, job opportunity surveys for employment agencies, joining community groups in identifying community needs and concerns. The list is endless.

Though, by its very concept, the Community Renewal College--like the program of community services on which it is based--must take its services beyond the limits of its central campus(es), the established campus need not be abandoned, for it is part and parcel of the over-all enterprise. Here students are briefed in the basics of their major fields of endeavor, be they university-oriented or occupation-bound. Here they develop representative ideas and methods of inquiry in social and behavioral sciences that will enable them to function efficiently in the real-world situations their community will provide in learning experiences. Here they find a home base to which they can periodically return for redirection when their own paths become blurred, and for reassurance when they falter in their determination. In other words, the central campus serves as a structuring agent for what otherwise could become diffuse activities.

The programs of community services form a vanguard for community development. As these services expand, so does the college. At Brookdale, for instance, we have programs in such community renewing subjects as "Aging--American Style" (helping middle-aged prepare for their status as senior citizens); "Women and the World of Work" (helping mature women to enter or return to careers); "Youth, Society, and Drugs" (helping parents and their children understand the consequences of drug abuse). In its conference on pollution abatement, the division arranged for unemployed and about-to-be-retired engineers, technologists, and scientists to come together to encourage new definitions of pollution problems, creating innovative designs for measuring and monitoring air and water quality, and developing new processes to combat specific pollution problems. In such ways do community services help to move the college into the community.

The Community Renewal College goes one step farther. It attempts to exemplify the purposes of higher education laid down by Peter Lowenberg in the November 1969 issue of the Journal of Higher Education: "The very spirit of education," he wrote, "is to help a student to realize his own potentialities, to let him discover what he really can do, not as imitation, not in response to command, nor because it has been charted for him, but because he has acquired a new view of himself and his capacity." If the Community Renewal College can do this, we will no longer be confronted with the ridiculous spectacle of the female graduate who exclaimed: "Four years of college! And whom has it got me?" We need to assert through positive action the responsibility we share as citizens to become a vital part of our communities--to share the joys, sorrows, problems, and promises as our own. In so doing, we will help to create a better neighborhood, a better county, and a better tomorrow.

NEW COMMUNITY PROGRAMS: A SYMPOSIUM

Glenn G. Gooder

Unfortunately, I have nothing especially new to suggest, no flaming example of a major breakthrough in education, but I have some possible additions and variations to an existing idea, which we are exploring at Santa Barbara City College.

As background, I shall give four facts, two assertions, and two suggestions.

Fact Number One: Colleges are not meeting the needs of adults.

There is little relationship between the number of advanced degrees granted in this country and the quality of life. Dagobert Ranes said it best in 1961 when he wrote:

> What good is all geography, knowing the look of people across the seven seas, if you don't know your neighbors across the yard? What good is knowing history, the Caesars of Rome and the Pharoahs of the Nile, if you don't want to understand the man across the street? Or knowing distant poets, playwrights, and spinners of tales, if you can't hear the black man's dirge or the June's song right in your own time! And what good is knowing the secrets of the atom and the science of light and space, if all it brings is more and more power into the fists of demagogues?

What good is it to turn out bright young men from our colleges and our professional schools, if they turn the most responsible office in the free world into a center of deceit, deception, and corruption?

Philosophy aside, the Commission on Non-Traditional Study of the American Council on Education tells us that nearly 80 million adults have an enormous appetite for further education. It is significant to note that their preference is for vocational subjects, hobbies and recreation, and family life and personal development, followed by general education.

The commission's survey also indicated that about 80 percent of these people would rather study somewhere else than at a four-year college or university. The community college ranked third among their choices as a setting for learning.

Fact Number Two: Colleges are not holding the attention of the traditional student.

Enrollments are dropping--partly because population increases are tapering off--but more so because college is no longer needed as a way to avoid military service, and a college degree is no longer a guarantee of high-paid employment. They are dropping off also because the attention of the new, media-oriented

generation simply cannot be sustained for eighteen or twenty weeks with learning experiences that, too often, are a repetition of previous experiences. Constant fiddling with academic calendars has not solved the problem.

Fact Number Three: The greatest social needs of the rest of this century will be those of the city.

Experiences of the 1960s have convinced us that our problems are poverty, disease, drugs, pollution, crowding, and crime. I would be the first to agree that the college cannot be all things to all people and the first to insist that our purpose is education, but I also agree with the members of the Carnegie Commission in "The Campus and the City" when they say:

> . . . The campus for 100 years and more has served agriculture, industry, and the professions and it cannot now deny service to the new claimants; it should not now or ever serve only the rich and the powerful, and deny the poor and the weak.

Fact Number Four: The campus relates to the city in several significant ways. Again, we borrow from the Carnegia Commission, which suggests the campus relates to the city by:

1. serving urban students
2. training for new occupations related to the needs of the city
3. providing general understanding to students and the public about the nature of urban civilization
4. conducting research through its individual faculty members on urban problems
5. providing service through its faculty members and students to hospitals, schools, and so forth
6. being a neighbor living in the same general environment
7. acting as an employer of local citizens.

Assertion Number One: The community college has a unique role to play in the last quarter of this century and none of us is yet playing that role.

We often refer to the fourfold promise of the community college: the promise to be a "comprehensive" college, a "teaching" college, an "open-door" college, and a "community" college. It is the fourth about which least is known. The great, universal needs of our communities are becoming clearer. The notion that the community college is the proper postsecondary educational institution to react to those needs is becoming more prevalent. Few models, however, have been developed and few patterns have emerged.

Assertion Number Two: It is virtually impossible to achieve dramatic change in the academic process.

I am so convinced of the accuracy of this statement that I despair of anything but change by evolution--change that does not pose a major threat to any of the basic interests involved in our current institutions.

Suggestion Number One: With these facts and assertions in mind,I advance, as suggestion number one, that we combine the strengths of continuing, adult, non-credit, community service education with those of the more traditional community college-credit program.

Needs of the future will not be met by the traditional program alone. Above and beyond our present strength, we need to add a flexible and responsive program of educational, cultural, and recreational services.

We must respond to an increasing general interest in learning, must set an example and develop a pattern in which Americans can move in and out of both formal and informal learning experiences all their lives and at times most convenient to them. We need greater freedom and flexibility in curriculum, and greater imagination in the use by the community of both community facilities and our own facilities. We need greater freedom and adaptability in organizational patterns and in delivery systems. These strengths are apparent in the best continuing education or community service programs. We need to embrace and develop them.

Suggestion Number Two: Our faculty and staff must find a way to break the time barriers in education by providing what many call "institutes." One group on our campus is calling them "cooperative learning programs." Lowell W. Culver of Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois, last April referred to "the learning module."

Monterey Peninsula College has offered institutes for about five years. They started in 1968 with topics selected from the core curriculum in electronics. They take out single elements from their courses and offer them for short periods with credit equated to time spent.

One of their most effective institutes has been on cultural conflicts experienced by their Mexican-American students in a white, middle-class school. The institute included inputs from psychology, sociology, linguistics, and history, each taught by a member of the college faculty.

We are thinking of learning experiences that would be action-oriented, result-oriented, problem-oriented, or research-oriented community projects, studies, seminars, experiments, and conferences. The institutes should be oriented to the "how" and the "now" and should be aimed at increasing awareness and understanding among citizens and at application of knowledge and career exploration among students. The traditional course work of students is expected to continue and to be supplemented by institute experience. The institutes should be scheduled in a variety of short-time blocks--such as six hours per week for three weeks, nine hours per week for six weeks, six hours per week for nine weeks, fifteen hours per week for four weeks, or any other

number of time blocks. Students could have several different institute experiences in a semester, as considerable variety in scheduling patterns could be developed for them without creating upheaval in existing schedules.

It is possible that a combination of traditional study and institute study would be preferred by many students. A comprehensive pattern of institutes would make it possible for every student to have a combination of traditional and institute study, if he desired. Initially, at least, we would expect to invite teachers to participate only if they chose to do so and to pay them on an hourly over-time basis.

If this can be developed, we will have an instrument for applying the educational services of the college--at our level of competence--to the human, social, and occupational needs of the community. This can also add a dimension to the learning experiences of our students and to some who are not now our students. It can be done without forcing either the college or the community to make unacceptable changes or accommodations in their present basic organizational patterns.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 15 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION